arXiv:1211.3989v1 [math.CO] 16 Nov 2012

Freiman's theorem in an arbitrary nilpotent group

Matthew Tointon

Abstract

We prove a Freiman–Ruzsa-type theorem valid in an arbitrary nilpotent group. Specifically, we show that a K-approximate group A in an s-step nilpotent group G is contained in a coset nilprogression of rank at most $K^{O_s(1)}$ and cardinality at most $e^{K^{O_s(1)}}|A|$. To motivate this, we give a direct proof of Breuillard and Green's analogous result for torsion-free nilpotent groups, avoiding the use of Mal'cev's embedding theorem.

Contents

1 Introduction **1**

2 Tools from the literature **5**

3 The torsion-free case **10**

4 Strategy of the general argument **15**

5 Images of multi-variable homomorphisms **18**

6 Placing arbitrary subgroups inside normal subgroups **21**

7 Proof of Proposition 4.3 **25**

8 Conclusion of the general case **27**

A Commutators and progressions **28**

B Decompositions of commutators **32**

C Generating sets of p-groups **38**

1 Introduction

In various situations in mathematics, considering approximate analogues of precise algebraic properties can lead to the objects they define becoming far more widely applicable. An area that has received considerable attention in that regard in recent years is the study of *approximate groups*. Originating in additive combinatorics, these objects have increasingly been applied to obtain results in a diverse array of other fields, such as number theory, differential geometry and theoretical computer science [2, 6].

Approximate-group theory really began with the celebrated theorem of Freiman [5] describing the structure of sets of integers that are approximately closed under addition. Specifically, writing

$$A + B := \{a + b : a \in A, b \in B\},$$

Freiman proved that if A is a finite subset of $\mathbb{Z}$ satisfying

$$|A + A| \leq K|A| \tag{1.1}$$

then A is contained in a *progression* P of *rank* $r \ll_K 1$ and cardinality $|P| \ll_K |A|$, which is to say a set of the form

$$P = \{x_0 + l_1x_1 + \ldots + l_rx_r : 0 \leq l_i \leq L_i\}. \tag{1.2}$$

Ruzsa [10] subsequently gave a simplified proof of this result.

In a more general abelian group G it still makes sense to ask for a classification of sets satisfying (1.1). However, Freiman's theorem cannot hold exactly as stated for $\mathbb{Z}$, since if G is a finite abelian group of high rank then G itself satisfies (1.1) for every $K \geq 1$, but it cannot be contained in any set P of the form (1.2).

Nonetheless, Green and Ruzsa [7] showed that this is essentially the only way in which Freiman's theorem can fail in an abelian group. Indeed, they showed that if G is an arbitrary abelian group and $A \subset G$ satisfies (1.1) then A is contained inside a set $H + P$, where H is a subgroup, P is of the form (1.2) and $|H + P| \ll_K |A|$. A set of this form is called a *coset progression*. Their result is stated precisely, with explicit bounds, as Theorem 2.3 in the present work. The best bounds currently available for a result of this type in an arbitrary abelian group are due to Sanders [12].

It is natural to ask whether similar results hold in non-abelian groups. To do so requires some more notation. If A and B are subsets of a multiplicative group then we denote by AB the set $\{ab : a \in A, b \in B\}$ and by A^{-1} the set $\{a^{-1} : a \in A\}$. We define $A^1 := A$ and $A^n := A(A^{n-1})$. Similarly, if A is a subset of an (additive) abelian group then we define $-A := \{-a : a \in A\}$, $1A := A$ and $nA := A((n-1)A)$.

The most naïve analogue of condition (1.1) for a non-abelian group would be the condition $|AA| \leq K|A|$. However, it turns out (see [13] for details) that the appropriate analogue in the non-abelian setting is to require that A is an *approximate group*, defined as follows.

Definition 1.1 (Approximate groups)**.** Let G be a (multiplicative) group and let $K \geq 1$. A finite set A in G is called a *K-approximate group* if

(i) it is symmetric, which is to say that $A^{-1} = A$, and contains the identity;

(ii) there is a symmetric subset X with $|X| \leq K$ such that $A^2 \subset XA$.

Remark 1.2. Some authors insist that the set X lies inside A^2, but we will not need this additional condition. In any case, one can without loss of generality assume that $X \subset A^3$.

Remarkably, Breuillard, Green and Tao [2] have shown that, with a suitable modification of the notion of a progression, if A is a K-approximate group inside an arbitrary group[1] then A can still be described in terms of a subgroup and a progression. Specifically, they show that A^4 contains a set HP satisfying $|HP| \gg_K |A|$, where H is a normal subgroup of a subgroup G_0 of G and the image of P in the quotient G_0/H is a *nilprogression* of rank and step $O_K(1)$, defined as follows.

Definition 1.3 (Nilprogressions)**.** Let $x_1, \dots, x_r$ be elements that generate an s-step nilpotent group and let $L = (L_1, \dots, L_r)$ be a vector of positive integers. Then the set of all products in the x_i and their inverses, in which each x_i and its inverse appear at most L_i times between them, is called a *nilprogression* of rank r, step s and side lengths $L_1, \dots, L_r$, and is denoted $P^*(x_1, \dots, x_r; L)$.

The proof of this result is long and far from elementary, and the bounds it gives are ineffective, and so it is of interest to have shorter proofs and better bounds for particular classes of G.

A fair amount is known in the case in which G is a nilpotent group. For example, an old argument of Ruzsa [11] can easily be adapted to show that if G is s-step nilpotent and every element of G has order at most m then a K-approximate group A must be contained inside a genuine subgroup of cardinality at most $O_{K,m,s}(|A|)$. On the other hand, Breuillard and Green [1] have shown that if A is a subset of a torsion-free nilpotent group then A is 'controlled'[2] by a set $P(x_1, \dots, x_r; L)$ called a *nilpotent progression*, which we define in Definition A.5. The notion of a nilpotent progression is not equivalent to that of a nilprogression, but the two are closely related. See Appendix A for details.

When a nilpotent group G contains elements of finite but unbounded order, however, the question has remained open. The present work resolves this question. Specifically, we prove the following result.

Theorem 1.4. *Let G be an s-step nilpotent group. Suppose that $A \subset G$ is a K-approximate group. Then there exist a subgroup H of G, normalised by A; an integer $k \leq K^{O_s(1)}$; elements $x_1, \dots, x_k$ of G; and lengths $L = (L_1, \dots, L_k)$ such that the nilprogression $P^* = P^*(x_1, \dots, x_k; L)$ and the nilpotent progression $P = P(x_1, \dots, x_k; L)$ satisfy*

$$A \subset HP^* \subset HP \subset A^{K^{O_s(1)}}.$$

Remark 1.5. In particular, by Lemma 2.7, $|HP^*| \leq |HP| \leq e^{K^{O_s(1)}}|A|$.

An immediate corollary of Theorem 1.4 is the following refinement of the Breuillard–Green theorem.

---

[1] Their result is also valid in the more general setting of *local* groups.

[2] The notion of control is standard in approximate group theory and gives a way of describing one set in terms of another. See [1, 13] for details.

Theorem 1.6. *Let G be torsion-free s-step nilpotent group. Suppose that $A \subset G$ is a K-approximate group. Then there exist $k \leq K^{O_s(1)}$, elements $x_1, \ldots, x_k$ of G and lengths $L = (L_1, \ldots, L_k)$ such that the nilprogression $P^* = P^*(x_1, \ldots, x_k; L)$ and the nilpotent progression $P = P(x_1, \ldots, x_k; L)$ satisfy*

$$A \subset P^* \subset P \subset A^{K^{O_s(1)}}.$$

Remark 1.7. In particular, by Lemma 2.7, $|P^*| \leq |P| \leq e^{K^{O_s(1)}}|A|$.

Remark 1.8. It follows from [3] that the group generated by A in Theorem 1.6 is of nilpotency class at most $O_K(1)$, and so the bounds in Theorem 1.6 can be taken to be independent of s (though they will no longer be polynomial in K).[3]

Remark 1.9. In principle it should be possible to reduce the rank k of the nilprogression in Theorems 1.4 and 1.6 to $6 \log_2 K$, as in [2, Theorem 2.12], although this would be at the expense of having A covered by $O_K(1)$ translates of HP^* rather than just one. We do not pursue this matter in the present work.

Many of the arguments we use to prove Theorem 1.4 are considerably simpler under the assumption that G is torsion free, and in that case they yield a very different proof of Theorem 1.6 from the argument of Breuillard and Green. Therefore, although Theorem 1.6 can be deduced directly from Theorem 1.4, before proving Theorem 1.4 we present a direct proof of Theorem 1.6. This will motivate much of what comes later, as well as making the arguments easier to digest initially.

The starting point for the proofs of Theorems 1.4 and 1.6 is the so-called *splitting lemma* of Tao [13, Lemma 7.7], which we present in Section 2. If an approximate group A lies inside a group G with normal subgroup N, this lemma essentially allows one to express A in terms of an approximate subgroup C of G/N and an approximate subgroup B of N.

As was pointed out in [13], this suggests an inductive approach to the study of nilpotent approximate groups, since taking $N = [G, G]$ in the case of a nilpotent group G would mean that both B and C were nilpotent of lower step. However, a difficulty in applying the splitting lemma, also identified in [13], is that it gives $A \subset \phi(C)B$, where ϕ is a certain 'approximate homomorphism' from G/N to G, and such approximate homomorphisms seem to be difficult to classify.

With this in mind, the principal combinatorial idea contained in the present work is to be found in Proposition 3.2, in which we are able to use the properties of ϕ, as well as a converse to the splitting lemma that is also found in [13], to express A in terms of a bounded product of approximate groups of lower step, without ever having to describe ϕ in detail. A fairly standard application of an argument of Chang then allows us to place A inside a product $A_1 \cdots A_r$ of $K^{O(1)}$-approximate groups of lower step, in which $A_i \subset A^{O(1)}$ and $r \leq K^{O(1)}$.

Once we have this statement the problem basically becomes an algebraic one. In particular, in the torsion-free case it is straightforward to proceed by induction to a situation in which the A_i are all abelian. The Green–Ruzsa theorem then allows us to assume that A is contained inside a product of abelian progressions, and it is then a conceptually easy, if technically tedious, matter to place A inside a nilpotent progression. The details are given in Section 3. The procession from containment inside a product of abelian progressions to containment inside a nilpotent progression relies on various results about commutators, which we present in Appendix B.

---

[3] Thanks to Ben Green for pointing this out.

Once we introduce the possibility of torsion into the problem the need to deal with finite subgroups makes things somewhat trickier. In Section 4 we describe our strategy for dealing with the resultant issues, before concluding the argument in Sections 5-8.

The arguments of Section 5 in particular rely on certain fundamental properties of p-groups; we present these properties in Appendix C.

Acknowledgements

The author is supported by an EPSRC doctoral training grant. For much of the time during which this work was carried out, he was also supported by a Bye-Fellowship from Magdalene College, Cambridge, and he is grateful to the College for their generosity. It is also a great pleasure to thank Ben Green for suggesting the problem and for numerous helpful conversations since.

2 Tools from the literature

In this section we collect together some tools from the literature on approximate groups. We start by reviewing some elements of abelian approximate-group theory. Given a set A in an abelian group, define the *doubling constant* of A to be the quantity $|A+A|/|A|$. The key abelian result is the following generalisation by Green and Ruzsa of Freiman's theorem.

Theorem 2.1 (Green–Ruzsa)**.** [7] *Suppose that X is a symmetric*[4] *subset of an abelian group with doubling constant at most K. Then $4X$ contains a coset progression $H+P$ of rank at most $K^{O(1)}$ and cardinality at least $e^{K^{O(1)}}|X|$.*

The following covering argument of Chang shows that the approximate group A is covered by a few translates of the coset progression $H+P$ given by Theorem 2.1.

Proposition 2.2 (Chang)**.** *Let G be a group and suppose that $A\subset G$ is a K-approximate subgroup. Let $B\subset A^M$ be a set with $|B|\geq|A|/C$. Then there exist sets $S_1,\ldots,S_t\subset A$ with $t\ll\log C+M\log K$ such that $|S_i|\leq 2K$ and*

$$A\subset S_{t-1}^{-1}\cdots S_1^{-1}B^{-1}BS_1\cdots S_t. \tag{2.1}$$

Proof. This is essentially identical to the argument given in [4], with the notation abstracted to allow for applications in non-abelian groups. Set $B_0:=B$. Now, given B_i, let R_{i+1} be a maximal subset of A with respect to the property that the translates B_ix with $x \in R_{i+1}$ are disjoint. If $|R_{i+1}| > 2K$ then let S_{i+1} be an arbitrary subset of R_{i+1} of cardinality $2K$ and set $B_{i+1} := B_iS_{i+1}$. If $|R_{i+1}| \leq 2K$ then set $S_{i+1} = R_{i+1}$ and stop.

---

[4] We assume symmetry here, and throughout this section, for purely notational reasons, so as to avoid the need to distinguish between X and $-X$.

The fact that the translates B_ix with $x \in S_{i+1}$ are disjoint implies that $|B_{i+1}| = |B_i||S_{i+1}|$, which in turn implies that that

$$|B_i| = |B||S_1| \cdots |S_i| \geq (2K)^i|A|/C. \tag{2.2}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$B_i \subset BS_1 \cdots S_i \subset A^{M+i},$$

and so

$$|B_i| \leq K^{M+i}|A|. \tag{2.3}$$

Combining (2.2) and (2.3) we see that

$$2^iK^i \leq CK^{M+i},$$

which in turn implies that $i \ll \log C + M \log K$. The algorithm therefore terminates after at most $O(\log C + M \log K)$ steps, and so we have defined $S_1, \ldots, S_t$ with $|S_i| \leq 2K$ and $t \ll \log C + M \log K$, as required. To prove (2.1), note that $S_t \subset A$ is maximal with the property that the translates $B_{t-1}x$ with $x \in S_t$ are disjoint, where of course $B_{t-1} = BS_1 \cdots S_{t-1}$. This implies in particular that for every $a \in A$ there exists $x \in S_t$ such that $B_{t-1}x \cap B_{t-1}a \neq \varnothing$, and so $A \subset B_{t-1}^{-1}B_{t-1}S_t$, which is precisely (2.1). □

Indeed, by viewing the sets S_i given by Chang's covering argument as extra dimensions in the progression P given by Theorem 2.1, we may in fact assume that A is *contained* in $H + P$. The details of that argument are given in [7]. The resulting statement is as follows.

Theorem 2.3 (Green–Ruzsa)**.** [7] *Suppose that X is a symmetic subset of an abelian group with doubling constant at most K. Then there is a subgroup $H \subset 4X$ and a progression $P = P(x_1, \ldots, x_k; L)$ of dimension at most $K^{O(1)}$ such that*

$$x_i \in 4X \qquad (i = 1, \ldots, k)$$

and

$$X \subset H + P \subset K^{O(1)}X.$$

We now move on to the more general theory of approximate groups, beginning with the following straightforward result.

Lemma 2.4. *Let G be a group and let $\rho : G \to H$ be a homomorphism with finite kernel. If $A \subset H$ is a K-approximate group then the pullback $\rho^{-1}(A)$ is a $2K$-approximate group.*

Proof. By definition there is a symmetric set X of cardinality at most K such that $A^2 \subset XA$. For each $x \in X$ select an element $\omega(x) \in \rho^{-1}(x)$. Set $\tilde{X} = \{\omega(x) : x \in X\} \cup \{\omega(x)^{-1} : x \in X\}$, so that $\tilde{X}$ is symmetric and of cardinality at most $2K$.

Now given $a_1, a_2 \in \rho^{-1}(A)$, note that by definition of X there exist $x \in X$ and $a \in \rho^{-1}(A)$ such that $\rho(a_1)\rho(a_2) = x\rho(a)$. This implies that there exists $b \in \ker\rho$ such that $a_1a_2 = \omega(x)ab$. However, $ab \in \rho^{-1}(A)$, and so $a_1a_2 \in \tilde{X}\rho^{-1}(A)$. The fact that $\ker\rho$ is finite certainly implies that $\rho^{-1}(A)$ is finite, and so $\rho^{-1}(A)$ is indeed a $2K$-approximate group. ☐

Remark 2.5. If we were to assume additionally that H had no elements of order 2 then we could insist that $\omega(x^{-1}) = \omega(x)^{-1}$ so that $\{\omega(x) : x \in X\}$ was symmetric, and hence conclude that $\rho^{-1}(A)$ was a K-approximate group.

Remark 2.6. It is also trivially the case that if $\tilde{A}$ is a K-approximate subgroup of G then $\rho(\tilde{A})$ is a K-approximate subgroup of H.

Lemma 2.7. [13, §3] *If A is a symmetric subset of a group, and contains the identity and satisfies $|A|^3 \leq K|A|$, then A^3 is an $O(K^{O(1)})$-approximate group. Furthermore, if A is a K-approximate group then $|A^n| \leq K^{n-1}|A|$ for every positive integer n.*

Lemma 2.8. *Let G be a discrete group with subgroup H and suppose that $A \subset G$ is a K-approximate subgroup. Let $m \geq 2$. Then the set $A^m \cap H$ is a K^{2m-1}-approximate subgroup and can be covered by at most K^{m-1} left-translates of $A^2 \cap H$.*

Proof. This is essentially found in [2, Lemma 10.3]. Since $A^2 \cap H \subset A^m \cap H$ and $(A^m \cap H)^2 \subset A^{2m} \cap H$, the second conclusion of the lemma would imply that $(A^m \cap H)^2$ could be covered by K^{2m-1} translates of $A^m \cap H$, and hence that $A^m \cap H$ was a K^{2m-1}-approximate group. It therefore suffices to prove the second conclusion of the lemma, namely that $A^m \cap H$ can be covered by at most K^{m-1} left-translates of $A^2 \cap H$.

The fact that A is a K-approximate group implies that there is a symmetric subset Y of cardinality at most K^{m-1} such that $A^m \subset YA$, and in particular that

$$A^m \cap H \subset YA. \tag{2.4}$$

We may assume that Y is minimal such that (2.4) holds, and hence that for each element $y \in Y$ there exists an element

$$\nu(y) \in H \cap yA. \tag{2.5}$$

Fix an arbitrary $y \in Y$ and note that (2.5) implies that there exist $a \in A$ such that

$$\nu(y) = ya. \tag{2.6}$$

Now note that for arbitrary $a' \in A$ we have $ya' = \nu(y)a^{-1}a'$ by (2.6), and so

$$yA \subset \nu(y)A^2. \tag{2.7}$$

Moreover, (2.5) implies that $\nu(y) \in H$, which certainly implies that $H \subset \nu(y)H$. Combined with (2.7) this gives

$$yA \cap H \subset \nu(y)(A^2 \cap H). \tag{2.8}$$

Since y was arbitrary, combining (2.4) and (2.8) yields,

$$A^m \cap H \subset \bigcup_{y \in Y} \nu(y)(A^2 \cap H),$$

from which the result is immediate. □

The rough strategy of the present work is to induct on the step s of G by splitting G into $[G,G]$ and $G/[G,G]$, each of which has step less than s. The behaviour of A under this splitting is described by the following lemma.

Lemma 2.9 (Tao's splitting lemma)**.** *Let G be a discrete group and let H be a normal subgroup. Write $\pi : G \to G/H$ for the canonical homomorphism. Suppose that $A \subset G$ is a finite symmetric set. Then there exists a partial inverse $\phi : \pi(A^m) \to A^m$ to π satisfying the following conditions.*

(i) $\phi(\pi(A^r)) \subset A^r$ *for* $r = 1, \dots, m$.

(ii) $\phi(1) = 1$.

(iii) For every $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \pi(A^r)$ with $x_1 \cdots x_n = 1$, and every $\varepsilon_i = \pm 1$, we have $\phi(x_1^{\varepsilon_1})^{\varepsilon_1} \cdots \phi(x_n^{\varepsilon_n})^{\varepsilon_n} \in A^{rn} \cap H$.

(iv) $A \subset \phi(\pi(A))(A^2 \cap H)$.

Remark 2.10. In light of Remark 2.6 and Lemma 2.8, the splitting lemma gives a K-approximate group $C \subset G/H$ and a K^3-approximate group $B \subset H$ such that $A \subset \phi(C)B$.

Proof of Lemma 2.9. The proof is all essentially contained in [13, Lemma 7.7]. It is trivial[5] that there exists a partial inverse ϕ to π satisfying conditions (i) and (ii); we claim that ϕ must additionally satisfy conditions (iii) and (iv).

To see that ϕ satisfies condition (iii), note that if $x_1 \cdots x_n = 1$ in G/H then this implies by definition that $\phi(x_1^{\varepsilon_1})^{\varepsilon_1} \cdots \phi(x_n^{\varepsilon_n})^{\varepsilon_n}$ lies in H. The fact that it also lies in A^{rn} is immediate from the symmetry of A and condition (i).

To verify condition (iv), note that for every $a \in A$ it follows from condition (i) and the symmetry of A that $\phi(\pi(a))^{-1}a \in A^2$, and hence that $a \in \phi(\pi(a))A^2$. Furthermore, the fact that a and $\phi(\pi(a))$ lie in the same fibre of π implies that $a \in \phi(\pi(a))H$. Thus $A \subset \phi(\pi(A))(A^2 \cap H)$, as required. □

Remark 2.11. If G has no 2-torsion then we may insist, as was done in [13], that $\phi(x^{-1}) = \phi(x)^{-1}$ for every x, in which case the exponents ε_i featuring in condition (iii) will be superfluous.

When applying the splitting lemma we shall repeatedly use the following observation; it is essentially trivial, but we record it as a lemma for ease of later reference.

Lemma 2.12. *Let G be a discrete group with a normal subgroup H. Write $\pi : G \to G/H$ for the canonical projection and suppose that $\phi : G/H \to G$ is a partial inverse to π. Let $C \subset G/H$ and let $B \subset H$. Then $|\phi(C)B| = |C||B|$.*

---

[5] Since A is finite there is no need to appeal to the axiom of choice here, as was pointed out in [13].

Proof. The cosets $\phi(c)H$ for $c \in C$ are disjoint, and so in particular the sets $\phi(c)B$ are disjoint. $\square$

Corollary 2.13. *Let G be a discrete group with a normal subgroup H and write $\pi : G \to G/[G,G]$ for the canonical homomorphism. Suppose that $A \subset G$ is a finite symmetric set. Then $|\pi(A)||A^2 \cap H| \geq |A|$.*

Proof. This is immediate from Lemmas 2.9 and 2.12. $\square$

We close this section with the following converse to the splitting lemma.

Lemma 2.14 (Converse to the splitting lemma)**.** *Let G be a discrete group with normal subgroup H, and write $\pi : G \to G/H$ for the canonical projection. Suppose that $C \subset G/H$ and $B_1 \subset B_2 \subset B_3 \subset B_4 \subset H$ are symmetric sets containing 1 such that*

$$|C^3| \leq K_1|C|; \tag{2.9}$$

$$|B_4| \leq K_2|B_1|; \tag{2.10}$$

$$|B_4^4| \leq K_3|B_4|. \tag{2.11}$$

Suppose further that $\phi : C^3 \to G$ is a partial inverse to π such that

$$\phi(x)B_i\phi(x)^{-1} \subset B_{i+1}; \quad \phi(x)^{-1}B_i\phi(x) \subset B_{i+1} \quad \textit{for all } x \in C \tag{2.12}$$

and such that whenever $\varepsilon_i = \pm 1$ we have

$$\phi(x_1^{\varepsilon_1})^{\varepsilon_1}\phi(x_2^{\varepsilon_2})^{\varepsilon_2}\phi(x_3^{\varepsilon_3})^{\varepsilon_3}\phi(x_4^{\varepsilon_4})^{\varepsilon_4} \in B_4 \qquad \textit{for all } x_i \in C^3 \textit{ with } x_1x_2x_3x_4 = 1. \tag{2.13}$$

Then we have

$$|(\phi(C)B_1 \cup B_1\phi(C)^{-1})^3| \leq K_1K_2K_3|(\phi(C)B_1 \cup B_1\phi(C)^{-1})|.$$

In particular, by Lemma 2.7, $(\phi(C)B_1 \cup B_1\phi(C)^{-1})^3$ is a $(K_1K_2K_3)^{O(1)}$-approximate group.

Proof. This, again, is essentially found in [13, Lemma 7.7]. Let $X_1, X_2, X_3 \in (\phi(C)B_1 \cup B_1\phi(C)^{-1})$ and write $x_i := \pi(X_i)$; then either $X_i \in \phi(x_i)B_1$ or $X_i \in B_1\phi(x_i^{-1})^{-1}$. In each case, repeated application of (2.12) implies that there exist $\varepsilon_i = \pm 1$ such that

$$X_1X_2X_3 \in \phi(x_1^{\varepsilon_1})^{\varepsilon_1}\phi(x_2^{\varepsilon_2})^{\varepsilon_2}\phi(x_3^{\varepsilon_3})^{\varepsilon_3}B_4^3.$$

An application of (2.13) then implies that

$$X_1X_2X_3 \in \phi(x_1x_2x_3)B_4^4 \subset \phi(C^3)B_4^4. \tag{2.14}$$

Lemma 2.12 combines with (2.9), (2.10) and (2.11) to imply that $|\phi(C^3)B_4^4| \leq K_1K_2K_3|\phi(C)B_1|$, and in conjunction with (2.14) this gives the result immediately. $\square$

3 The torsion-free case

We will seek to use the splitting lemma to express A in terms of approximate groups of lower nilpotency class. To motivate matters, we consider first the torsion-free case, where the details are cleanest. The key result is the following.

Proposition 3.1. *Let G be a torsion-free s-step nilpotent group with $s \geq 2$ and suppose that $A \subset G$ is a K-approximate subgroup. Then there exist an integer $r \leq K^{O(1)}$ and $K^{O(1)}$-approximate groups $A_1, \ldots, A_r \subset A^{O(1)}$, each of which generates a subgroup of step less than s, such that*

$$A \subset A_1 \cdots A_r.$$

We deduce Proposition 3.1 from the following result.

Proposition 3.2. *Let G be a torsion-free s-step nilpotent group and suppose that $A \subset G$ is a K-approximate subgroup. Then there exist an integer $r \leq K^{O(1)}$ and $K^{O(1)}$-approximate groups $A_1, \ldots, A_r \subset A^{O(1)}$, each of which generates a subgroup of step less than s, such that*

$$|A_1 \cdots A_r| \geq e^{-K^{O(1)}}|A|.$$

Proof. Write $\pi : G \to G/[G, G]$ for the natural projection; then $\pi(A)$ is trivially a K-approximate group, and so by Theorem 2.1 there is a proper abelian progression $P = P(x_1, \ldots, x_r; L)$ of dimension

$$r \leq K^{O(1)} \tag{3.1}$$

such that

$$P \subset \pi(A^4) \tag{3.2}$$

and

$$|P| \geq e^{-K^{O(1)}}|\pi(A)|. \tag{3.3}$$

Set

$$X_n := A^n \cap [G, G],$$

and for each $i = 1, \ldots, r$ write

$$P_i := \{lx_i : |l| \leq L_i\}$$

so that $P = P_1 + \ldots + P_r$. Let ϕ be a partial inverse $\phi : \pi(A^{12}) \to A^{12}$ to π given by applying Lemma 2.9 in the case $m = 12$. By conditions (i) and (iii) of that lemma and (3.2), for any $l_1, \ldots, l_r$ satisfying $|l_i| \leq L_i$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi(l_1x_1 + \ldots + l_rx_r) &\in \phi(l_1x_1 + \ldots + l_{r-1}x_{r-1})\phi(l_rx_r)X_{12} \\
&\subset \phi(l_1x_1 + \ldots + l_{r-2}x_{r-2})X_{12}\phi(l_{r-1}x_{r-1})X_{12}\phi(l_rx_r)X_{12} \\
&\ \ \vdots \\
&\subset \phi(l_1x_1)\phi(l_2x_2)X_{12} \cdots \phi(l_{r-1}x_{r-1})X_{12}\phi(l_rx_r)X_{12},
\end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\phi(P) \subset \phi(P_1)\phi(P_2)X_{12} \cdots \phi(P_{r-1})X_{12}\phi(P_r)X_{12} \tag{3.4}$$

Now (3.2), condition (i) of Lemma 2.9 and the symmetry of A imply that

$$\phi(y)^{-1}B_n\phi(y) \subset B_{n+8}; \quad \phi(y)B_n\phi(y)^{-1} \subset B_{n+8} \quad \text{for all } y \in P, \tag{3.5}$$

and so from (3.4) we can conclude that

$$\phi(P) \subset \phi(P_1)X_{20}\phi(P_2)X_{20}\cdots\phi(P_{r-1})X_{20}\phi(P_r),$$

and hence that

$$\phi(P)X_{20} \subset \phi(P_1)X_{20}\phi(P_2)X_{20}\cdots\phi(P_r)X_{20}. \tag{3.6}$$

Now Lemma 2.8 implies that $|X_n^4| \le K^{O(n)}|X_n|$ and that $|X_n| \le K^n|X_{n'}|$ for every $X_{n'}$, and of course we have $|3P_i| \le 3|P_i|$. Combined with (3.5) and condition (iii) of Lemma 2.9 this means that we may apply Lemma 2.14 with $C = P_i$, $B_1 = X_{20}$, $B_2 = X_{28}$, $B_3 = X_{36}$ and $B_4 = X_{48}$ to conclude that

$$A_i := (\phi(P_i)X_{20} \cup X_{20}\phi(P_i)^{-1})^3$$

is a $K^{O(1)}$-approximate group.

By the definitions of ϕ and X_n we have $A_i \in A^{O(1)}$, as desired. To see that $|A_1\cdots A_r| \ge e^{-K^{O(1)}}|A|$, simply note that

$$\begin{aligned}
|A_1\cdots A_r| &\ge |\phi(P)X_{20}| && \text{(by (3.6))}\\
&= |P||X_{20}| && \text{(by Lemma 2.12)}\\
&\ge e^{-K^{O(1)}}|\pi(A)||X_{20}| && \text{(by (3.3))}\\
&\ge e^{-K^{O(1)}}|A| && \text{(by Corollary 2.13).}
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, note that for $|l| \le L_i$ we have $\phi(lx_i) \subset \phi(x_i)^l[G,G]$, and so $\phi(P_i)X_{20}$, and hence A_i, is a subset of the group $\langle\phi(x_i)\rangle[G,G]$, which is of step at most $s-1$. This completes the proof. □

Proof of Proposition 3.1. Proposition 3.2 gives an integer

$$k \le K^{O(1)} \tag{3.7}$$

and $K^{O(1)}$-approximate groups

$$A_1, \dots, A_k \in A^{O(1)}, \tag{3.8}$$

each of which generates a subgroup of step less than s, such that

$$|A_1\cdots A_k| \ge e^{-K^{O(1)}}|A|. \tag{3.9}$$

By (3.7) and (3.8) we also have

$$A_1\cdots A_k \subset A^{K^{O(1)}}. \tag{3.10}$$

In light of (3.9) and (3.10), applying Proposition 2.2 to $A_1\cdots A_k$ with $M = K^{O(1)}$ and $C = e^{K^{O(1)}}$ then yields sets

$$S_1, \dots S_t \subset A \tag{3.11}$$

with

$$t \le K^{O(1)} \tag{3.12}$$

and

$$|S_i| \le 2K \tag{3.13}$$

such that

$$A \subset S_{t-1}^{-1} \cdots S_1^{-1} A_k \cdots A_1 A_1 \cdots A_k S_1 \cdots S_t. \tag{3.14}$$

Let $s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_m$ be a list of all elements of S_1, followed by those of S_2, then those of S_3 and so on all the way up to the elements of S_t, noting that if an element belongs to more than one set S_i then it will appear on the list more than once. Note that (3.12) and (3.13) imply that

$$m \le K^{O(1)}. \tag{3.15}$$

It follows from (3.14) that

$$A \subset P(s_m; 1) \cdots P(s_1; 1) X_k \cdots X_1 X_1 \cdots X_k P(s_1; 1) \cdots P(s_m; 1). \tag{3.16}$$

For each i the set $P(s_i; 1)$ is an abelian 2-approximate group, and by (3.11) it lies inside A, and so the desired result follows from (3.7), (3.8), (3.15) and (3.16). □

Corollary 3.3. *Let G be a torsion-free s-step nilpotent group and suppose that $A \subset G$ is a K-approximate subgroup. Then there exist an integer $r \le K^{O_s(1)}$ and abelian $K^{O_s(1)}$-approximate groups $A_1, \ldots, A_r \subset A^{O_s(1)}$ such that*

$$A \subset A_1 \cdots A_r.$$

Proof. This follows from Proposition 3.1 and induction. □

By Theorem 2.3, of course, we can place each abelian approximate group A_i given by Corollary 3.3 inside an abelian progression, and hence place A itself inside a product of abelian progressions. We now define a structure that will encompass such a product.

Definition 3.4 (Ordered progression)**.** Let $x_1, \ldots, x_r \in G$ and let $L_1, \ldots, L_r \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the *ordered progression* on generators $x_1, \ldots, x_r$ with lengths $L_1, \ldots, L_r$ is defined to be

$$P_{\mathrm{ord}}(x_1, \ldots, x_r; L) := \{x_1^{l_1} \cdots x_r^{l_r} : |l_i| \le L_i\}.$$

Define r to be the *rank* of $P_{\mathrm{ord}}(x_1, \ldots, x_r; L)$.

The nilprogressions, nilpotent progressions and ordered progressions defined in Definitions 1.3, A.5 and 3.4 are not, in general, the same objects. We do, however, have the following statement, which shows that we can at least pass from one to another fairly efficiently.

Proposition 3.5. *Let G be an s-step nilpotent group and suppose that $x_1, \ldots, x_r \in G$ and $L_1, \ldots, L_r \in \mathbb{N}$. Then*

$$P_{\mathrm{ord}}(x_1, \ldots, x_r; L) \subset P^*(x_1, \ldots, x_r; L) \subset P(x_1, \ldots, x_r; L) \subset P_{\mathrm{ord}}(x_1, \ldots, x_r; L)^{r^{O_s(1)}}$$

The proof of Proposition 3.5 relies on material on commutators from the appendices. In particular, we make use of the notions of *basic commutators*, defined in Definition A.4, and *commutator forms*, defined in Definition B.2.

To facilitate the proof of Proposition 3.5 we introduce one more piece of notation. Given group elements $x_1,\dots,x_k$ and a vector of positive integers $L=(L_1,\dots,L_k)$ we define

$$B(x_1,\dots,x_k;L):=\bigcup_{i=1}^{k}\{l_ix_i:|l_i|\le L_i\}.$$

We note the trivial inclusion

$$B(x_1,\dots,x_k;L)\subset P_{\mathrm{ord}}(x_1,\dots,x_k;L), \tag{3.17}$$

and that the role of $B(x_1,\dots,x_k;L)$ in our argument will be comparable to that of the set $\mathfrak{b}$ appearing in the proof of [1, Proposition 4.4].

Lemma 3.6. *Let $x_1,\dots,x_r$ be elements of an s-step nilpotent group and let $L=(L_1,\dots,L_r)$ be a vector of positive integers. Let α be a commutator form of weight r. Then for every integer m satisfying $|m|\le L_1\cdots L_r$ we have*

$$\alpha(x_1,\dots,x_r)^m\in B(x_1,\dots,x_r;L)^{O_s(1)}.$$

Proof. For $r>s$ the commutator $\alpha(x_1,\dots,x_r)$ is equal to the identity and therefore the lemma holds trivially, and so we may assume that

$$r\le s. \tag{3.18}$$

We shall in fact show that

$$\alpha(x_1,\dots,x_r)^m\in B(x_1,\dots,x_r;L)^{O_{r,s}(1)}; \tag{3.19}$$

(3.18) shows that this is sufficient to imply the lemma.

We may assume by induction that (3.19) holds holds for all commutators of weight greater than r. By symmetry of $B(x_1,\dots,x_r;L)$ we may assume that $m\ge 0$, and it then follows directly from [1, Lemma 4.3] that there are non-negative integers

$$l_i^{(j)}\le L_i \tag{3.20}$$

for $i=1,\dots,r$ and $j=1,\dots,2^{r-1}$ such that

$$m=(l_1^{(1)}\cdots l_r^{(1)})+\ldots+(l_1^{(2^{r-1})}\cdots l_r^{(2^{r-1})}).$$

Hence

$$\alpha(x_1,\dots,x_r)^m=\alpha(x_1,\dots,x_r)^{l_1^{(1)}\cdots l_r^{(1)}}\cdots\alpha(x_1,\dots,x_r)^{l_1^{(2^{r-1})}\cdots l_r^{(2^{r-1})}}. \tag{3.21}$$

Let $\zeta_1,\dots,\zeta_t$ be as defined in the statement of Proposition B.4, and note that

$$t\ll_{r,s}1. \tag{3.22}$$

It then follows from Proposition B.4 that there exist, for $i = 1, \dots, t$ and $j = 1, \dots, 2^{r-1}$, integers $m_i^{(j)}$ with

$$|m_i^{(j)}| \leq l^{\chi(\eta_i)} \tag{3.23}$$

such that

$$\alpha(x_1, \dots, x_r)^{l_1^{(j)} \cdots l_r^{(j)}} = \alpha(x_1^{l_1^{(j)}}, \dots, x_r^{l_r^{(j)}}) \zeta_t^{m_t^{(j)}} \cdots \zeta_1^{m_1^{(j)}}.$$

Substituting this into (3.21) we may conclude that

$$\alpha(x_1, \dots, x_r)^m = \prod_{j=1}^{2^{r-1}} \alpha(x_1^{l_1^{(j)}}, \dots, x_r^{l_r^{(j)}}) \zeta_t^{m_t^{(j)}} \cdots \zeta_1^{m_1^{(j)}}. \tag{3.24}$$

Now (3.20) implies that

$$\alpha(x_1^{l_1^{(j)}}, \dots, x_r^{l_r^{(j)}}) \in B(x_1, \dots, x_r; L)^{O_r(1)}, \tag{3.25}$$

and by (3.23) and induction we have

$$\zeta_i^{m_i^{(j)}} \in B(x_1, \dots, x_r; L)^{O_{r,s}(1)}. \tag{3.26}$$

A combination of (3.22), (3.24), (3.25) and (3.26) gives (3.19), as claimed. □

Proof of Proposition 3.5. The first inclusion is trivial and the second is given by Corollary A.8, and so it remains only to prove the third inclusion. Write $c_1, \dots, c_t$ for the list of basic commutators in the x_i. The number of commutator shapes of weight at most s is clearly finite, and there are at most r^s commutators in $x_1, \dots, x_r$ of any such shape, and so in particular we have

$$t \leq r^{O_s(1)}. \tag{3.27}$$

It is clear from the definition of B that

$$B(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_k}; (L_{j_1}, \dots, L_{j_k})) \subset B(x_1, \dots, x_r; L), \tag{3.28}$$

Moreover, for a given basic commutator $c_i = \alpha(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_k})$ it follows from Lemma 3.6 that whenever $|m_i| \leq L^{\chi(c_i)}$ we have

$$c_i^{m_i} \in B(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_k}; (L_{j_1}, \dots, L_{j_k}))^{O_s(1)},$$

which by (3.17) and (3.28) implies that

$$c_i^{m_i} \in P_{\mathrm{ord}}(x_1, \dots, x_r; L)^{O_s(1)}.$$

However, the elements of $P(x_1, \dots, x_k; L)$ are precisely those of the form

$$c_1^{m_i} \cdots c_t^{m_t}$$

with $|m_i| \leq L^{\chi(c_i)}$, and so (3.27) implies the result. □

Proof of Theorem 1.6. By Corollary 3.3 there exist an integer

$$r \leq K^{O_s(1)} \tag{3.29}$$

and abelian $K^{O_s(1)}$-approximate groups

$$A_1, \ldots, A_r \subset A^{O_s(1)} \tag{3.30}$$

satisfying

$$A \subset A_1 \cdots A_r. \tag{3.31}$$

Theorem 2.3 implies that there exist, for each $j = 1, \ldots, r$, an abelian progression $P^{(j)} := P(x_1^{(j)}, \ldots, x_{k_j}^{(j)}; L^{(j)})$ satisfying

$$k_j \leq K^{O_s(1)} \tag{3.32}$$

and

$$A_j \subset P^{(j)} \subset A_j^{K^{O_s(1)}}. \tag{3.33}$$

Combining (3.29), (3.30), (3.31) and (3.33) then implies that $A \subset P^{(1)} \cdots P^{(r)} \subset A^{K^{O_s(1)}}$, and so writing

$$(y_1, \ldots, y_m) := (x_1^{(1)}, \ldots, x_{k_1}^{(1)}, x_1^{(2)}, \ldots, x_{k_2}^{(2)}, \ldots, x_1^{(r)}, \ldots, x_{k_r}^{(r)})$$

and

$$(N_1, \ldots, N_m) := (L_1^{(1)}, \ldots, L_{k_1}^{(1)}, L_1^{(2)}, \ldots, L_{k_2}^{(2)}, \ldots, L_1^{(r)}, \ldots, L_{k_r}^{(r)}),$$

gives

$$A \subset P_{\mathrm{ord}}(y_1, \ldots, y_m; N) \subset A^{K^{O_s(1)}}. \tag{3.34}$$

Furthermore,

$$m \leq K^{O_s(1)} \tag{3.35}$$

by (3.29) and (3.32). Theorem 1.6 then follows from (3.34), (3.35) and Proposition 3.5. □

4 Strategy of the general argument

Let us pause at this point to consider how the argument we used in proving Theorem 1.6 might be adapted to work in an arbitrary nilpotent group.

The key observation of the torsion-free argument was Proposition 3.1, which essentially allowed us to express an approximate group of step s as a product of $O_K(1)$ approximate groups of step at most $s-1$. However, such a statement is simply not true in the absence of the torsion-free assumption, as illustrated by the following example.

Example 4.1. Let F be the free product of n copies of the cyclic group with two elements, and let G be the quotient F/F_{s+1}. This might reasonably be called the 'free s-step nilpotent group on n generators of order 2'. Then G is a genuine s-step nilpotent group, and so is certainly an s-step K-approximate group for any $K \geq 1$. However, G cannot be expressed as a product of $O(1)$ sets of nilpotency class less than s as $n \to \infty$.

Having observed that the statement of Proposition 3.1 fails in an arbitrary nilpotent group, let us examine where the proof breaks down. The key to the proof of Proposition 3.1 was Proposition 3.2, which allowed us to place a product of $K^{O(1)}$ approximate groups densely inside $A^{K^{O(1)}}$. In the notation of that proposition, the proof had four major steps.

Step 1. $\pi(A^4)$ contains a dense progression $P = P_1 + \ldots + P_r$ by Theorem 2.1.

Step 2. $A^{O(1)} \cap [G,G]$ contains a set X such that the set $\phi(P_1)X \cdots \phi(P_r)X$ is dense in $A^{K^{O(1)}}$.

Step 3. $\phi(P_i)X$ has small tripling, and so $(\phi(P_i)X \cup X\phi(P_i))^3$ is an approximate group inside $A^{O(1)}$.

Step 4. $\phi(P_i)X$ lies inside $\langle\phi(x_i)\rangle[G,G]$, which is easily verified to be of step at most $s-1$.

Analogues steps 1 to 3 hold in an arbitrary nilpotent group, although some modification is necessary due to the fact that Theorem 2.1 gives a *coset* progression $H' + P$ inside $\pi(A^4)$, rather than just a progression P. Specifically, inserting $H' + P$ into the proof in place of P gives the following.

Step 1′. $\pi(A^4)$ contains a dense coset progression $H' + P = H' + P_1 + \ldots + P_r$ by Theorem 2.1.

Step 2′. $A^{O(1)} \cap [G,G]$ contains a set X such that the set $\phi(H')X\phi(P_1)X \cdots \phi(P_r)X$ is dense in $A^{K^{O(1)}}$.

Step 3′. $\phi(H')X$ and $\phi(P_i)X$ have small tripling, and so $A_0 := (\phi(H')X \cup X\phi(H'))^3$ and $A_1(\phi(P_i)X \cup X\phi(P_i))^3$ are approximate groups inside $A^{O(1)}$.

Step 4, on the other hand, is problematic, since A_0 is not necessarily of step less than s. Furthermore, as Example 4.1 illustrates, this obstruction is unavoidable.

Nonetheless, in the context of Theorem 1.4 all is not lost, as whilst Theorem 1.4 is stronger than Theorem 1.6, the conclusion of Theorem 1.4 in a torsion group is, in a certain sense, weaker than the conclusion of Theorem 1.6. Indeed, where Theorem 1.6 required us to show that a K-approximate group A was dense inside a nilprogression P^*, Theorem 1.4 requires us only to show that the image of A in a quotient by some normal subgroup $H \subset A^{K^{O(1)}}$ is dense inside a nilprogression. This allows us to make the following reduction.

Lemma 4.2. *Let G and A be as in Theorem 1.4, and assume additionally that G is generated by A. Suppose that $N \lhd G$ is a normal subgroup and that $N \subset A^{K^{O(1)}}$. Suppose Theorem 1.4 holds in the quotient G/N. Then Theorem 1.4 holds in G, albeit with different implied constants.*

Proof sketch. Write $\rho : G \to G/N$ for the canonical projection. Since $\rho(A)$ is a K-approximate group, the fact that Theorem 1.4 holds in G/N implies that there is a normal subgroup H of G/N and a nilprogression $\mathcal{P} \subset G/N$ such that

$$\rho(A) \subset H\mathcal{P} \subset \rho(A^{K^{O(1)}}).$$

However, the fact that $N \subset A^{K^{O(1)}}$ implies that

$$A \subset \rho^{-1}(H\mathcal{P}) \subset A^{K^{O(1)}},$$

and it is straightforward to check that $\tilde{H} = \rho^{-1}(H)$ is a normal subgroup of G and that there is a nilprogression $\tilde{P}^* \subset G$ with the property that $\rho^{-1}(H\mathcal{P}) = \tilde{H}\tilde{P}^*$. □

The upshot of this is that if there is some subset B of A that we don't understand, then it is sufficient to find some normal subgroup N of G inside $A^{K^{O(1)}}$ that contains B and restrict attention to the quotient G/N, in which the image of B is trivial.

Let us return to the troublesome set $A_0 := (\phi(H')X \cup X\phi(H'))^3$. The problem we had was that A_0 was potentially of step s, whereas if we are aiming for an analogue of step 4 above then ideally we would like A_0 to be of step at most $s-1$. In light of Lemma 4.2, a reasonable substitute for A_0 being of step $s-1$ would be the following.

Step 4′. A_i is of step at most $s-1$ for $i \geq 1$, and there is a normal subgroup $N \lhd G$ inside $A^{K^{O(1)}}$ such that the image of A_0 inside G/N is of step at most $s-1$.

It turns out that achieving a statement of this type is indeed possible, and ultimately yields the following statement.

Proposition 4.3. *Let $m > 0, s, \hat{s} \geq 2$ be integers. Let G be an s-step nilpotent group generated by a K-approximate group A, and let $\tilde{A}$ be an $\tilde{s}$-step $\tilde{K}$-approximate group inside A^m. Then there exist an integer $r \leq \tilde{K}^{O(1)}$, a normal subgroup N inside $A^{K^{O_{m,s}(1)}}$ and $\tilde{K}^{O(1)}$-approximate groups $A_1, \dots, A_r \subset \tilde{A}^{O(1)}$ such that every commutator form[6] α of weight $\tilde{s}$ satisfies $\alpha(A_i, \dots, A_i) \subset N$ for all i, and such that*

$$\tilde{A} \subset A_1 \cdots A_r.$$

Remark 4.4. If G is assumed to be torsion free in Proposition 4.3 then the finite subgroup N is automatically trivial, and so we recover the statement of Proposition 3.1.

The next few sections are largely dedicated to the proof of Proposition 4.3, with the conclusion of that proof appearing in Section 7.

Before we embark on the details in full, let us give a flavour of the overall argument in a particularly simple case, namely that of a 2-step p-group. In that case, Step 4′ essentially requires that we identify a normal subgroup $N \lhd G$ inside $A^{K^{O(1)}}$ that contains $[A_0, A_0]$. Since $[A_0, A_0]$ is central, the group $\langle [A_0, A_0] \rangle$ generated by $[A_0, A_0]$ will automatically be normal, and so in fact it is sufficient to show the following.

Lemma 4.5. *In the case that G is a 2-step p-group generated by A we have $\langle [A_0, A_0] \rangle \subset A^{K^{O(1)}}$.*

---

[6] Commutator forms are defined in Definition B.2.

Proof sketch. The proof rests on the observation that in a 2-step group the identities (B.2) and (B.3) imply that the commutator bracket $[\,,\,]$ is a homomorphism in each variable. Moreover, the definition of a 2-step group implies that $[\,,\,]$ is trivial if either argument belongs to $[G,G]$. Thus $[\,,\,]$ induces a well defined map $\varphi : G/[G,G] \times G/[G,G] \to [G,G]$ given by

$$\varphi(\pi(x),\pi(y)) = [x,y],$$

and this map is also a homomorphism in each variable. In particular, since $\pi(A_0) = H'$, we have $[A_0,A_0] = \varphi(H',H')$.

Now $\varphi(H',H')$, and hence $[A_0,A_0]$, is a union of the subgroups $\varphi(H',h)$ with $h \in H'$. To deal with such sets we have the following result.

Lemma 4.6. *Let Γ be an abelian p-group of rank r (written multiplicatively) and suppose that $X \subset \Gamma$ is a union of subgroups of Γ. Then*

$$\langle X\rangle \subset X^r.$$

Proof. Lemma C.1 implies that $\langle X\rangle$ is of rank at most r, and so Lemma C.2 implies that there exist elements $x_1,\ldots,x_r \in X$ that generate $\langle X\rangle$. It follows that $\langle X\rangle = \langle x_1\rangle\cdots\langle x_r\rangle$. However, the assumption that X is a union of subgroups implies that $\langle x_i\rangle \subset X$ for each i, and so $\langle x_1\rangle\cdots\langle x_r\rangle \subset X^r$ and the lemma is proved. ☐

Remark 4.7. The assumption in Lemma 4.6 that Γ is a p-group is necessary. The statement fails, for example, if $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}/6\mathbb{Z}$ and X is the union of the subgroups $\{0,2,4\}$ and $\{0,3\}$. This is not surprising in light of Remark C.4.

Now $[A_0,A_0]$ is a subset of $A^{O(1)} \cap [G,G]$, which is a set with doubling constant at most $K^{O(1)}$ by Lemma 2.8. Theorem 2.3 therefore implies that there is a subgroup $U \subset A^{O(1)}$ and a progression Q of rank at most $K^{O(1)}$ such that $A^{O(1)} \cap [G,G] \subset UQ$. Write $\tau : G \to G/U$ for the canonical projection and note that the rank bound on Q implies that $[\tau(A_0),\tau(A_0)]$ lies in an abelian p-group of rank at most $K^{O(1)}$.

It therefore follows from Lemma 4.6 that

$$\langle[\tau(A_0),\tau(A_0)]\rangle \subset [\tau(A_0),\tau(A_0)]^{K^{O(1)}},$$

and hence that

$$\langle[A_0,A_0]\rangle \subset [A_0,A_0]^{K^{O(1)}}U \subset A^{K^{O(1)}},$$

as desired. ☐

In the next few sections we generalise these arguments to deal with arbitrary nilpotent groups.

5 Images of multi-variable homomorphisms

In the previous section we observed that in a 2-step group the commutator bracket is a homomorphism in each variable. The following generalisation of that statement is an immediate corollary of Proposition B.3. Recall that commutator forms are defined in Definition B.2.

Lemma 5.1. *If α is a commutator form of weight s and G is an s-step nilpotent group then α is a homomorphism in each variable on G. Furthermore, $\alpha(x_1,\ldots,x_s)$ is trivial whenever there is some i with $x_i\in[G,G]$.*

The final conclusion of Lemma 5.1 is particularly useful in conjunction with the following result, the proof of which is left as a simple exercise.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $k>0$ be an integer and let $\Gamma,\Gamma_1,\ldots,\Gamma_k$ be groups. For each $i=1,\ldots,k$ let Γ_i' be a normal subgroup of Γ_i, and write $\rho_i:\Gamma_i\to\Gamma_i/\Gamma_i'$ for the canonical homomorphism. Suppose that $\varphi:\Gamma_1\times\cdots\times\Gamma_k\to\Gamma$ is a map that is a homomorphism in each variable, and suppose that φ is trivial whenever there is an i such that the ith argument of φ belongs to Γ_i'. Then the function*

$$\begin{array}{rccc}\psi & : & \Gamma_1/\Gamma_1'\times\cdots\times\Gamma_k/\Gamma_k' & \to & \Gamma\\ & & (\rho_1(x_1),\ldots,\rho_k(x_k)) & \mapsto & \varphi(x_1,\ldots,x_k)\end{array}$$

is well defined and a homomorphism in each variable.

Moreover, if for each i there is a subgroup H_i of Γ_i/Γ_i' and a set $X_i\subset\Gamma_i$ satisfying $\rho_i(X_i)=H_i$ then we have

$$\varphi(X_1,\ldots,X_k)=\psi(H_1,\ldots,H_k).$$

With this in mind, in this section we study such 'multi-variable' homomorphisms. The main result is the following variant of Lemma 4.6. Here, and throughout the present section, abelian groups will be written multiplicatively for clarity.

Proposition 5.3. *Let $k>0$ be an integer, let $\Gamma_1,\ldots,\Gamma_k$ be finite nilpotent groups and let Γ be an abelian group of rank at most r. Let $\varphi:\Gamma_1\times\cdots\times\Gamma_k\to\Gamma$ be a map that is a homomorphism in each variable. Then*

$$\langle\varphi(\Gamma_1,\ldots,\Gamma_k)\rangle\subset\varphi(\Gamma_1,\ldots,\Gamma_k)^r.$$

We start with the following observation, which is essentially identical to an observation made in the previous section.

Lemma 5.4. *Proposition 5.3 holds when Γ is a p-group.*

Proof. This follows immediately from Lemma 4.6 and the observation that $\varphi(\Gamma_1,\ldots,\Gamma_k)$ can be expressed as a union of the subgroups $\varphi(\Gamma_1,x_2,\ldots,x_k)$ with $x_i\in\Gamma_i$. □

A key fact that will enable us to proceed from Lemma 5.4 to Proposition 5.3 is the following alternative characterisation of nilpotency in a finite group.

Proposition 5.5. [8, Theorem 10.3.4] *A finite group is nilpotent if and only if it is a direct product of p-groups.*

The proof of Proposition 5.3 then rests on the following observation.

Lemma 5.6. *For $i=1,\ldots,k$ let $\Gamma_i=\prod_p\Gamma_i(p)$ be a direct product of p-groups $\Gamma_i(p)$, and let $\Gamma=\Gamma(0)\otimes\prod_p\Gamma(p)$ be a direct product of a torsion-free abelian* *group* $\Gamma(0)$ *and abelian* p*-groups* $\Gamma(p)$*. Let* $\varphi : \Gamma_1 \times \cdots \times \Gamma_k \to \Gamma$ *be a map that is a homomorphism in each variable. Then whenever* $u_i(p) \in \Gamma_i(p)$ *we have*

$$\varphi(u_1(p), \dots, u_k(p)) \in \Gamma(p) \tag{5.1}$$

and

$$\varphi(\textstyle\prod_p u_1(p), \dots, \prod_p u_k(p)) = \prod_p \varphi(u_1(p), \dots, u_k(p)). \tag{5.2}$$

Proof. Since φ is a homomorphism in each variable, the order of $\varphi(u_1(p), \dots, u_k(p))$ divides the order of each $u_i(p)$. One consequence of this is that the order of $\varphi(u_1(p), \dots, u_k(p))$ is a power of p, and so (5.1) holds. Another consequence is that if $i < j$ and $p \neq q$ then

$$\varphi(*, \dots, *, u_i(p), *, \dots, *, u_j(q), *, \dots, *) = 1,$$

regardless of the starred entries, and so expanding $\varphi(\prod_p u_1(p), \dots, \prod_p u_k(p))$ in each variable gives (5.2). □

Proof of Proposition 5.3. Proposition 5.5 implies that we can express each Γ_i as direct products of p-groups, as in Lemma 5.6. Furthermore, the structure theorem for finitely generated abelian groups shows that we decompose Γ as a direct product $\Gamma(0) \otimes \prod_p \Gamma(p)$ of a torsion-free abelian group $\Gamma(0)$ and abelian p-groups $\Gamma(p)$, also as in Lemma 5.6. Write π_p for the canonical projection of Γ onto $\Gamma(p)$, and note that if X is a generating set for Γ then $\pi_p(X)$ is a generating set for $\Gamma(p)$. In particular, this gives

$$\operatorname{rank} \Gamma(p) \leq r. \tag{5.3}$$

Furthermore, $\pi_p \circ \varphi$ is a map from $\Gamma_1 \times \cdots \times \Gamma_k$ to $\Gamma(p)$ that is a homomorphism in each variable, and so Lemma 5.4 combines with (5.3) to give

$$\langle \pi_p(\varphi(\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_k)) \rangle \subset \pi_p(\varphi(\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_k))^r.$$

Combined with Lemma 5.6 this implies that

$$\langle \varphi(\Gamma_1(p), \dots, \Gamma_k(p)) \rangle \subset \varphi(\Gamma_1(p), \dots, \Gamma_k(p))^r. \tag{5.4}$$

We therefore have

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \varphi(\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_k) \rangle &= \left\langle \varphi\left(\textstyle\prod_p \Gamma_1(p), \dots, \prod_p \Gamma_k(p) \right) \right\rangle \\
&= \left\langle \textstyle\prod_p \varphi(\Gamma_1(p), \dots, \Gamma_k(p)) \right\rangle && \text{by Lemma 5.6} \\
&= \textstyle\prod_p \langle \varphi(\Gamma_1(p), \dots, \Gamma_k(p)) \rangle \\
&\subset \textstyle\prod_p (\varphi(\Gamma_1(p), \dots, \Gamma_k(p))^r) && \text{by (5.4)} \\
&= \left(\textstyle\prod_p \varphi(\Gamma_1(p), \dots, \Gamma_k(p)) \right)^r \\
&= \varphi\left(\textstyle\prod_p \Gamma_1(p), \dots, \prod_p \Gamma_k(p) \right)^r && \text{by Lemma 5.6} \\
&= \varphi(\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_k)^r,
\end{aligned}$$

as desired. □

6 Placing arbitrary subgroups inside normal subgroups

Even if we were to assume Proposition 4.3, and hence reduce to the case in which the approximate group A could be placed inside a bounded product $A_1 \cdots A_r$ of approximate groups of lower step, there would still be a significant obstacle to deducing Theorem 1.4 inductively. This is because applying Theorem 1.4 to the approximate group A_1, say, would produce a subgroup H that was normalised by A_1 but not necessarily normalised by the whole of A.

It is of significant interest, therefore, to be able to place arbitrary subgroups of G efficiently inside *normal* subgroups of G. The primary aim of this section is to prove the following result in this direction.

Proposition 6.1. *Let G be an s-step nilpotent group generated by a K-approximate group A. Let $H \subset A^M$ be a subgroup of G. Then there exists a normal subgroup N of G inside $A^{K^{O_{M,s}(1)}}$ with the property that $H \subset N$.*

Many of the arguments we use to prove Proposition 6.1 apply, with almost no modification, to images of multi-variable homomorphisms of the type we studied in the previous section. Moreover, it turns out that these more general results are useful in proving Proposition 4.3. The results of this section, as stated, are therefore more general that is strictly necessary in order to prove Proposition 6.1.

We start with a simple observation about approximate groups.

Lemma 6.2. *Let G be a group generated by a K-approximate group A, and write $\pi : G \to G/[G,G]$ for the natural projection. Then there exist an integer $k \leq K^{O(1)}$, a subgroup $H_1 \subset \pi(A^4)$ and elements $x_2, \dots, x_k \in A^4$ such that $G/[G,G]$ is generated by $H_1 \cup \{\pi(x_2), \dots, \pi(x_k)\}$.*

Proof. The image $\pi(A)$ is a K-approximate group, and so Theorem 2.3 implies that there exist an integer $k \leq K^{O(1)}$, a subgroup $H_1 \subset \pi(A^4)$, and elements $x_2, \dots, x_k \in A^4$ such that $\pi(A)$ is contained in a coset progression of the form $H_1 + P(\pi(x_2), \dots, \pi(x_k); L)$. However, $G/[G,G]$ is generated by $\pi(A)$, and so the result follows. □

Lemma 6.2 is particularly useful when applied in conjunction with the following result.

Lemma 6.3. *Let G be a group with generating set A, and write $\pi : G \to G/[G,G]$ for the canonical homomorphism. Suppose that $\pi(A^m)$ contains sets $X_1, \dots, X_k$, such that for each $i = 1, \dots, k$ either X_i is a finite subgroup H_i of $G/[G,G]$ or X_i is a singleton $\{\pi(x_i)\}$, with $x_i \in A^m$, and such that $G/[G,G]$ is generated by the union $X_1 \cup \ldots \cup X_k$.*

Let $\tilde{H}_1, \dots, \tilde{H}_{\tilde{s}}$ be finite nilpotent groups and suppose that

$$\alpha : \tilde{H}_1 \times \cdots \times \tilde{H}_{\tilde{s}} \to G$$

is a homomorphism in each variable with the property that

$$\alpha(\tilde{H}_1, \dots, \tilde{H}_{\tilde{s}}) \subset A^M. \tag{6.1}$$

Let $n \geq 1$ be an integer and suppose that for all commutator forms γ of weight greater than $n+1$ we have

$$\gamma(\alpha(\tilde{H}_1, \ldots, \tilde{H}_{\tilde{s}}), G, \ldots, G) = \{1\}. \tag{6.2}$$

Finally, suppose that there is an abelian subgroup Γ of rank d with the property that whenever β is a commutator form of weight $n+1$ we have

$$\beta(\alpha(\tilde{H}_1, \ldots, \tilde{H}_{\tilde{s}}), A^m, \ldots, A^m) \subset \Gamma. \tag{6.3}$$

Then there exists a central subgroup $U(\alpha) \subset A^{O_{m,M,n}(dk^n)}$ such that whenever β is a commutator form of weight $n+1$ we have

$$\beta(\alpha(\tilde{H}_1, \ldots, \tilde{H}_{\tilde{s}}), G, \ldots, G) \subset U(\alpha).$$

Proof. For $X_i = H_i$ we may fix $Y_i \in A^m$ such that $H_i = \pi(Y_i)$. For $X_i = \{\pi(x_i)\}$ fix $Y_i := \{x_i\}$, so that

$$Y_i \subset A^m \tag{6.4}$$

and

$$\pi(Y_i) = X_i. \tag{6.5}$$

For each $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \ldots, i_n) \in [k]^n$ and each commutator form β of weight $n+1$ define

$$U_{\mathbf{i}}(\alpha, \beta) := \langle \beta(\alpha(\tilde{H}_1, \ldots, \tilde{H}_{\tilde{s}}), Y_{i_1}, \ldots, Y_{i_n}) \rangle,$$

Since the commutator form $[\beta, \iota]$ is of weight greater than $n+1$, condition (6.2) implies that

$$\beta(\alpha(\tilde{H}_1, \ldots, \tilde{H}_{\tilde{s}}), G, \ldots, G) \subset Z(G), \tag{6.6}$$

and so $U_{\mathbf{i}}(\alpha, \beta)$ is a central subgroup. We may therefore define a further central subgroup $U(\alpha, \beta)$ by

$$U(\alpha, \beta) := \prod_{\mathbf{i} \in [k]^n} U_{\mathbf{i}}(\alpha, \beta),$$

and yet another central subgroup

$$U(\alpha) := \prod_{\beta : |\chi(\beta)| = n+1} U(\alpha, \beta).$$

Now fix a commutator form β of weight $n+1$. It follows from Proposition B.3, and the fact that every commutator form γ of weight greater than $n+1$ satisfies (6.2), that the map

$$\varphi : (\tilde{h}_1, \ldots, \tilde{h}_{\tilde{s}}, g_1, \ldots, g_n) \mapsto \beta(\alpha(\tilde{h}_1, \ldots, \tilde{h}_{\tilde{s}}), g_1, \ldots, g_n)$$

is a homomorphism in each variable, and also that this φ is trivial if there is some $g_i \in [G, G]$. Lemma 5.2 therefore implies that there is a function

$$\psi : \tilde{H}_1 \times \cdots \times \tilde{H}_{\tilde{s}} \times G/[G, G] \times \cdots \times G/[G, G] \to G$$

that is a homomorphism in each variable and satisfies

$$\beta(\alpha(\tilde{h}_1, \ldots, \tilde{h}_{\tilde{s}}), g_1, \ldots, g_n) = \psi(\tilde{h}_1, \ldots, \tilde{h}_{\tilde{s}}, \pi(g_1), \ldots, \pi(g_n)). \tag{6.7}$$

Combined with (6.6), this implies that

$$\beta(\alpha(\tilde{H}_1,\dots,\tilde{H}_{\tilde{s}},G,\dots,G)\subset\prod_{\mathbf{i}\in[k]^n}\langle\psi(\tilde{H}_1,\dots,\tilde{H}_{\tilde{s}},X_{i_1},\dots,X_{i_n})\rangle. \qquad (6.8)$$

Now (6.7) also implies that

$$\beta(\alpha(\tilde{H}_1,\dots,\tilde{H}_{\tilde{s}}),Y_{i_1},\dots,Y_{i_n})=\psi(\tilde{H}_1,\dots,\tilde{H}_{\tilde{s}},X_{i_1},\dots,X_{i_n}), \qquad (6.9)$$

and so it follows from (6.8) that

$$\beta(\alpha(\tilde{H}_1,\dots,\tilde{H}_{\tilde{s}}),G,\dots,G)\subset U(\alpha,\beta). \qquad (6.10)$$

Furthermore, the fact that β is of weight $n+1$ means that β satisfies (6.3), and so (6.4) and (6.9) imply that

$$\psi(\tilde{H}_1,\dots,\tilde{H}_{\tilde{s}},X_{i_1},\dots,X_{i_n})\subset\Gamma.$$

Proposition 5.3 therefore yields

$$\langle\psi(\tilde{H}_1,\dots,\tilde{H}_{\tilde{s}},X_{i_1},\dots,X_{i_n})\rangle\subset\psi(\tilde{H}_1,\dots,\tilde{H}_{\tilde{s}},X_{i_1},\dots,X_{i_n})^d.$$

Combined with (6.1), (6.4) and (6.9), this gives

$$\langle\psi(\tilde{H}_1,\dots,\tilde{H}_{\tilde{s}},X_{i_1},\dots,X_{i_n})\rangle\subset A^{c(n+1)(m+M)d},$$

where we write $c(l)$ for the maximum of the lenghts, as words in the letters $x_1,\dots,x_l$, of all commutators in the x_i of weight l, noting that this is the maximum of a finite set, and so well defined and finite. It therefore follows from (6.9) that $U_{\mathbf{i}}(\alpha,\beta)\subset A^{O_{m,M,n}(d)}$. Since there are finitely many commutator forms of weight at most n, this implies that $U_{\mathbf{i}}(\alpha)\subset A^{O_{m,M,n}(d)}$, and so

$$U(\alpha)\subset A^{O_{m,M,n}(dk^n)},$$

as desired. The fact that

$$\beta(\alpha(\tilde{H}_1,\dots,\tilde{H}_{\tilde{s}}),G,\dots,G)\subset U(\alpha).$$

for every commutator form β of weight $n+1$ is immediate from (6.10), and so the lemma is proved. □

Proposition 6.4. *Let G be a nilpotent group generated by a K-approximate group A. Let $\tilde{H}_1,\dots,\tilde{H}_{\tilde{s}}$ be finite nilpotent groups and suppose that*

$$\alpha:\tilde{H}_1\times\cdots\times\tilde{H}_{\tilde{s}}\to G$$

is a homomorphism in each variable with the property that

$$\alpha(\tilde{H}_1,\dots,\tilde{H}_{\tilde{s}})\subset A^M. \qquad (6.11)$$

Let $n\geq 0$ be an integer and suppose that for every commutator form γ of weight greater than n we have

$$\gamma(\alpha(\tilde{H}_1,\dots,\tilde{H}_{\tilde{s}}),G,\dots,G)=\{1\}. \qquad (6.12)$$

Then there exists a normal subgroup N of G inside $A^{K^{O_{M,n}(1)}}$ with the property that $\alpha(\tilde{H}_1,\dots,\tilde{H}_{\tilde{s}})\subset N$.

Proof. The result is trivially true if $n = 0$, and so by induction we may fix $n = n' \geq 1$ and assume that the lemma holds whenever $n < n'$.

As before, write $c(l)$ for the maximum of the lenghts, as words in the letters $x_1, \dots, x_l$, of all commutators in the x_i of weight l, noting that this is the maximum of a finite set, and so well defined and finite.

The centre $Z(G)$ is normal, and so Lemma 2.8 implies that $A^{c(n)\max\{M,4\}} \cap Z(G)$ has doubling constant at most $K^{O_{M,n}(1)}$, and so Theorem 2.3 implies that $A^{c(n)\max\{M,4\}} \cap Z(G)$ is contained inside an abelian coset progression ZQ, with

$$Z \subset A^{O_{M,n}(1)} \tag{6.13}$$

a subgroup and Q a progression of rank at most $K^{O_{M,n}(1)}$. The fact that Z is central implies in particular that it is normal in G, and so we may define the canonical projection $\rho : G \to G/Z$.

Now the fact that every commutator form γ of weight greater than n satisfies (6.12) means that if β is a commutator form of weight exactly n then

$$\beta(\alpha(\tilde{H}_1, \dots, \tilde{H}_{\tilde{s}}), A^4, \dots, A^4) \subset Z(G),$$

and so (6.11) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\beta(\alpha(\tilde{H}_1, \dots, \tilde{H}_{\tilde{s}}), A^4, \dots, A^4) &\subset A^{c(n)\max\{M,4\}} \cap Z(G)\\ &\subset Z \cdot \langle Q \rangle.\end{aligned}$$

In particular, this implies that

$$\beta(\rho(\alpha(\tilde{H}_1, \dots, \tilde{H}_{\tilde{s}})), \rho(A)^4, \dots, \rho(A)^4) \subset \langle \rho(Q) \rangle.$$

Furthermore, the rank of $\langle \rho(Q) \rangle$ is at most $K^{O_{M,n}(1)}$, and the group G/Z is generated by the K-approximate group $\rho(A)$. Lemma 6.2 therefore implies that we can apply Lemma 6.3 to obtain a central subgroup U of G/Z satisfying

$$U \subset \rho(A)^{K^{O_{M,n}(1)}} \tag{6.14}$$

such that whenever β is a commutator form of weight n we have

$$\beta(\rho(\alpha(\tilde{H}_1, \dots, \tilde{H}_{\tilde{s}})), G/Z, \dots, G/Z) \subset U. \tag{6.15}$$

Since U is central in G/Z, the pullback $N_0 := \rho^{-1}(U)$ is a normal subgroup of G, and by (6.15) it satisfies

$$\beta(\alpha(\tilde{H}_1, \dots, \tilde{H}_{\tilde{s}}), G, \dots, G) \subset N_0.$$

In particular, writing $\tau : G \to G/N_0$ for the canonical projection we have

$$\beta(\tau(\alpha(\tilde{H}_1, \dots, \tilde{H}_{\tilde{s}})), G/N_0, \dots, G/N_0) = \{1\}$$

whenever β is a commutator form of weight n. The inductive hypothesis therefore implies that there is a normal subgroup N_1 of G/N_0 satisfying

$$N_1 \subset \tau(A)^{K^{O_{M,n}(1)}} \tag{6.16}$$

and such that $\tau(\alpha(\tilde{H}_1, \dots, \tilde{H}_{\tilde{s}})) \subset N_1$. Setting $N := \tau^{-1}(N_1)$, this implies that $\alpha(\tilde{H}_1, \dots, \tilde{H}_{\tilde{s}}) \subset N$. Furthermore, (6.13) and (6.14) imply that $N_0 \subset A^{K^{O_{M,n}(1)}}$, and so (6.16) implies that $N \subset A^{K^{O_{M,n}(1)}}$. □

Proof of Proposition 6.1. Apply Proposition 6.4 with α the inclusion homomorphism $\alpha : H \hookrightarrow G$. $\square$

7 Proof of Proposition 4.3

The first step in the proof of Proposition 4.3 is the following.

Proposition 7.1. *Let $\tilde{s} \geq 2$ be an integer and let $\tilde{G}$ be an $\tilde{s}$-step nilpotent group generated by a $\tilde{K}$-approximate group $\tilde{A}$. Write $\tilde{\pi} : \tilde{G} \to \tilde{G}/[\tilde{G}, \tilde{G}]$ for the canonical projection. Then there exist $r \leq \tilde{K}^{O(1)}$ and $\tilde{K}^{O(1)}$-approximate groups $A_0, \ldots, A_r \subset \tilde{A}^{O(1)}$, and a genuine subgroup $\tilde{H} \subset \tilde{\pi}(\tilde{A}^4)$, such that $\tilde{\pi}(A_0) = \tilde{H}$, such that each of $A_1, \ldots, A_r$ generates a group of step less that $\tilde{s}$, and such that*

$$|A_0 \cdots A_r| \geq e^{-\tilde{K}^{O(1)}} |\tilde{A}|.$$

Proof. It is trivial that $\tilde{\pi}(\tilde{A})$ is a $\tilde{K}$-approximate group, and so by Theorem 2.1 there is a group $\tilde{H}$ and a proper abelian progression $\tilde{P} = P(x_1, \ldots, x_r; L)$ of dimension

$$r \leq \tilde{K}^{O(1)} \tag{7.1}$$

such that

$$\tilde{H} + \tilde{P} \subset \tilde{\pi}(\tilde{A}^4) \tag{7.2}$$

and

$$|\tilde{H} + \tilde{P}| \geq e^{-\tilde{K}^{O(1)}} |\tilde{\pi}(\tilde{A})|. \tag{7.3}$$

Just as we did in the proof of Proposition 3.2, we write

$$\tilde{P}_i := \{l x_i : |l| \leq L_i\},$$

so that $\tilde{P} = \tilde{P}_1 + \ldots + \tilde{P}_r$ and fix a partial inverse $\tilde{\phi} : \tilde{\pi}(\tilde{A}^{12}) \to \tilde{A}^{12}$ to $\tilde{\pi}$ given by applying Lemma 2.9 in the case $m = 12$. Setting

$$X := \tilde{A}^{20} \cap [\tilde{G}, \tilde{G}]$$

this gives, by an identical argument to the one we used in Proposition 3.2,

$$\tilde{\phi}(\tilde{H} + \tilde{P})X \subset \tilde{\phi}(\tilde{H})X\tilde{\phi}(\tilde{P}_1)X \cdots \tilde{\phi}(\tilde{P}_r)X.$$

By exactly the same argument that we used in Proposition 3.2, we conclude that

$$A_0 := (\tilde{\phi}(\tilde{H})X \cup X\tilde{\phi}(\tilde{H})^{-1})^3$$

and

$$A_i := (\phi(\tilde{P}_i)X \cup X\phi(\tilde{P}_i)^{-1})^3 \quad (i = 1, \ldots, r)$$

are all $\tilde{K}^{O(1)}$-approximate groups inside $\tilde{A}^{O(1)}$ and that

$$|A_0 A_1 \cdots A_r| \geq e^{-\tilde{K}^{O(1)}} |\tilde{A}|.$$

Now, just as in Proposition 3.2, the sets $A_1, \ldots, A_r$ all generate groups of step less than $\tilde{s}$, as desired. On the other hand, $\tilde{\pi}(A_0) = \tilde{H}$ by definition of A_0, and $\tilde{H} \subset \tilde{\pi}(\tilde{A}^4)$ by (7.2), and so the proposition is proved. $\square$

To deduce Proposition 4.3 from Proposition 7.1 requires us to identify a normal subgroup N inside $A^{K^{O_{m,s}(1)}}$ that contains every commutator of weight $\tilde{s}$ in the elements of A_0. We achieve this as follows.

Lemma 7.2. *Let G be a nilpotent group generated by a K-approximate group A. Let $\tilde{s} \geq 2$, let $\tilde{G}$ be an $\tilde{s}$-step nilpotent subgroup of G, and write $\tilde{\pi} : \tilde{G} \to \tilde{G}/[\tilde{G}, \tilde{G}]$ for the canonical homomorphism. Suppose that $\tilde{H}$ is a finite subgroup of $\tilde{G}/[\tilde{G}, \tilde{G}]$ and that $A_0 \subset A^{\tilde{m}} \cap \tilde{G}$ is a set satisfying $\tilde{\pi}(A_0) = \tilde{H}$.*

Let $n \geq 1$ be an integer and suppose that for all commutator forms α of weight $\tilde{s}$ and γ of weight greater than n we have

$$\gamma(\alpha(A_0, \ldots, A_0), G, \ldots, G) = \{1\}.$$

Then there is a normal subgroup N of G inside $A^{K^{O_{\tilde{m},n,\tilde{s}}(1)}}$ with the property that whenever α is a commutator form of weight $\tilde{s}$ we have

$$\alpha(A_0, \ldots, A_0) \subset N.$$

Proof. The lemma is trivially true if $n = 0$, and so by induction we may fix $n = n' \geq 1$ and assume that the lemma holds whenever $n < n'$.

As before, write $c(l)$ for the maximum of the lenghts, as words in the letters $x_1, \ldots, x_l$, of all commutators in the x_i of weight l, noting that this is the maximum of a finite set, and so well defined and finite.

Fix an arbitrary commutator form α of weight $\tilde{s}$. It follows from Lemmas 5.1 and 5.2 that there is a function

$$\overline{\alpha} : \tilde{G}/[\tilde{G}, \tilde{G}] \times \cdots \times \tilde{G}/[\tilde{G}, \tilde{G}] \to G$$

that is a homomorphism in each variable and such that

$$\alpha(\tilde{g}_1, \ldots, \tilde{g}_{\tilde{s}}) = \overline{\alpha}(\tilde{\pi}(\tilde{g}_1), \ldots, \tilde{\pi}(\tilde{g}_{\tilde{s}})).$$

In particular,

$$\alpha(A_0, \ldots, A_0) = \overline{\alpha}(\tilde{H}, \ldots, \tilde{H}),$$

from which it follows that

$$\overline{\alpha}(\tilde{H}, \ldots, \tilde{H}) \subset A^{c(\tilde{s})\tilde{m}}.$$

Proposition 6.4 therefore implies that there is a normal subgroup N_α of G inside $A^{K^{O_{\tilde{m},n,\tilde{s}}(1)}}$ such that

$$\alpha(A_0, \ldots, A_0) \subset N_\alpha. \tag{7.4}$$

Set $N := \prod_{\alpha : |\chi(\alpha)| = \tilde{s}} N_\alpha$; this is a product with $O_{\tilde{s}}(1)$ terms, and so $N \subset A^{K^{O_{\tilde{m},n,\tilde{s}}(1)}}$. Moreover, by (7.4) we have

$$\alpha(A_0, \ldots, A_0) \subset N$$

for every commutator form α of weight $\tilde{s}$, and so the lemma is proved. ☐

Proof of Proposition 4.3. The fact that G is of nilpotency class at most s implies that every commutator form of weight greater than s vanishes on G, and so combining Proposition 7.1 and Lemma 7.2 gives an integer $r \leq \tilde{K}^{O(1)}$, a normal subgroup N inside $A^{K^{O_{m,s}(1)}}$, and $\tilde{K}^{O(1)}$-approximate groups $A_0, \ldots, A_r \subset \tilde{A}^{O(1)}$ such that every commutator form α of weight $\tilde{s}$ satisfies $\alpha(A_i, \ldots, A_i) \subset N$ for all i, and such that

$$|A_0 \cdots A_r| \geq e^{-\tilde{K}^{O(1)}}|\tilde{A}|.$$

The result then follows from applying Chang's covering lemma in exactly the same way as in the proof of Proposition 3.1. □

8 Conclusion of the general case

In this section we present the final steps of the proof of Theorem 1.4, beginning with the following.

Proposition 8.1. *Let $m > 0, s, \hat{s} \leq s$ be integers. Let G be an s-step nilpotent group generated by a K-approximate group A, and let $\tilde{A}$ be an $\tilde{s}$-step $\tilde{K}$-approximate group inside A^m. Then there exist an integer $r \leq \tilde{K}^{O_{\tilde{s}}(1)}$, a normal subgroup N inside $A^{K^{O_{m,s,\tilde{s}}(1)}}$, and $\tilde{K}^{O_{\tilde{s}}(1)}$-approximate groups $A_1, \ldots, A_r \subset \tilde{A}^{O_{\tilde{s}}(1)}N$ such that $[A_i, A_i] \subset N$ for all i and such that*

$$\tilde{A} \subset A_1 \cdots A_r.$$

Proof. If $\tilde{A}$ is abelian then the proposition is trivially true, and so we may assume by induction that $s \geq \tilde{s} \geq 2$ and that the proposition holds for all smaller values of $\tilde{s}$.

Applying Proposition 4.3, we obtain an integer $r_0 \leq \tilde{K}^{O(1)}$, a normal subgroup N_0 of G inside $A^{K^{O_{m,s}(1)}}$, and $\tilde{K}^{O(1)}$-approximate groups $A_1, \ldots, A_{r_0} \subset \tilde{A}^{O(1)}$ such that every commutator form α of weight $\tilde{s}$ satisfies $\alpha(A_i, \ldots, A_i) \subset N_0$ for all i, and such that

$$\tilde{A} \subset A_1 \cdots A_{r_0}.$$

Writing $\rho : G \to G/N_0$ for the canonical projection, we therefore have $\tilde{K}^{O(1)}$-approximate groups $\rho(A_1), \ldots, \rho(A_{r_0}) \subset \rho(\tilde{A})^{O(1)} \subset \rho(A)^{O(m)}$ of step at most $\tilde{s} - 1$ satisfying

$$\rho(\tilde{A}) \subset \rho(A_1) \cdots \rho(A_{r_0}).$$

Since G/N_0 is generated by the K-approximate group $\rho(A)$, the induction hypothesis therefore gives, for each $i = 1, \ldots, r_0$, an integer $r_i \leq \tilde{K}^{O_{\tilde{s}}(1)}$, a normal subgroup N_i of G/N_0 inside $\rho(A)^{K^{O_{m,s,\tilde{s}}(1)}}$, and $\tilde{K}^{O_{\tilde{s}}(1)}$-approximate groups $A_1^{(i)}, \ldots, A_{r_i}^{(i)} \subset \rho(A_i)^{O_{\tilde{s}}(1)}N_i \subset \rho(\tilde{A})^{O_{\tilde{s}}(1)}N_i$ such that $[A_j^{(i)}, A_j^{(i)}] \subset N_i$ for all j and such that

$$\tilde{A}_i \subset A_1^{(i)} \cdots A_{r_i}^{(i)}.$$

It follows from Lemma 2.4 that the $\rho^{-1}(A_j^{(i)})$ are $\tilde{K}^{O_{\tilde{s}}(1)}$-approximate groups, and so the proposition is satisfied by taking $N = \rho^{-1}(N_1 \cdots N_{r_0})$. □

Remark 8.2. When applying Proposition 8.1 the dependence of various implied constants on $\tilde{s}$ may of course be absorbed into the dependence on s. The dependence on $\tilde{s}$ is present only to make the proof clearer.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. Let N and $A_1, \ldots, A_r$ be the normal subgroup and approximate groups given by applying Proposition 8.1 with $\tilde{A} = A$, noting that

$$N \subset A^{K^{O_s(1)}} \tag{8.1}$$

and that

$$r \leq K^{O_s(1)}. \tag{8.2}$$

Write $\rho : G \to G/N$ for the canonical projection and note that $\rho(A_1), \ldots, \rho(A_r)$ are abelian $K^{O_s(1)}$-approximate groups. As such, Theorem 2.3 implies that there are subgroups $H_i \subset \rho(A_i)^4 \subset \rho(A)^{O_s(1)}$ and abeilan progressions

$$P_i \subset \rho(A_i)^{K^{O_s(1)}}, \tag{8.3}$$

each of rank at most $K^{O_s(1)}$, such that

$$\rho(A) \subset H_1 P_1 \cdots H_r P_r. \tag{8.4}$$

Proposition 6.1 then implies that for each $i = 1, \ldots, r$ there is a normal subgroup N_i of G/N that contains H_i and satisfies $N_i \subset \rho(A)^{K^{O_s(1)}}$. By (8.2), the normal subgroup $N_1 \cdots N_r$ also satisfies

$$N_1 \cdots N_r \subset \rho(A)^{K^{O_s(1)}},$$

and so by (8.1) the normal subgroup $H = \rho^{-1}(N_1 \cdots N_r)$ satisfies

$$H \subset A^{K^{O_s(1)}}.$$

Write $\tau : G \to G/H$ for the canonical projection. The bound on the ranks of the P_i, combined with (8.2) and (8.4), implies that $\tau(A)$ is contained in an ordered progression P of rank at most $K^{O_s(1)}$, and by (8.2) and (8.3) we have $P \subset \tau(A)^{K^{O_s(1)}}$. The result then follows from Proposition 3.5. □

A Commutators and progressions

In this appendix we develop enough theory about commutators to be able to define a nilpotent progression, and hence to understand the statement of Theorem 1.4. Following a set up in [1, §1] that was in turn based on [8, §11.1] we introduce the following definitions.

Definition A.1 (Commutators and weights)**.** We define *(formal) commutators* in the letters $x_1, \ldots, x_r$ recursively by defining each x_i to be a formal commutator and, given two formal commutators α, α' in the x_j, defining $[\alpha, \alpha']$ also to be a formal commutator.

To each commutator α we assign a *weight vector* $\chi(\alpha) \in \mathbb{N}_0^r$, defined recursively by setting $\chi(x_i) := e_i$ and, given two formal commutators α, α' in the x_j, defining $\chi([\alpha, \alpha']) = \chi(\alpha) + \chi(\alpha')$. We define the *total weight* of a commutator α to be $|\chi(\alpha)| := \|\chi(\alpha)\|_1$. Given a weignt vector $\chi \in \mathbb{N}_0^r$ and a vector $L = (L_1, \ldots, L_r)$ of positive integers we will denote $L^\chi := L_1^{\chi_1} \cdots L_r^{\chi_r}$.

Noting that this results in at most finitely many commutators of any given weight vector, we assign a fixed total ordering $\prec$ to the commutators, chosen arbitrarily subject to the conditions that $x_1 \prec \ldots \prec x_r$, that commutators of the same weight vector are consecutive, and that commutators of lower total weight come before commutators of higher total weight.

Finally, for each commutator α we define the *(formal) inverse commutator* α^{-1}. We extend $\prec$ to a partial ordering of commutators and their formal inverses, defining $\alpha^{\pm 1} \prec \beta^{\pm 1}$ when $\alpha \prec \beta$. ◇

Of course, for elements u, v in a group the commutator $[u, v]$ is interpreted as the group element $u^{-1}v^{-1}uv$, and the formal inverse of a commutator α is interpreted as the inverse of the interpretation of α. Thus if $x_1, \ldots, x_r$ are group elements then the formal commutators in the x_i, and their inverses, have interpretations as group elements.[7] In the case where the x_i are elements of a *nilpotent* group there only finitely many commutators with non-trivial interpretations as group elements, and an argument from [8, §11.1] shows that they satisfy the following rather nice property.

Lemma A.2. *Let $x_1, \ldots, x_r$ be elements in an s-step nilpotent group and let $y_1 \prec \ldots \prec y_k$ be a complete list of commutators of total weight at most s in the x_i, with $y_i = x_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, r$. Then every element of the group generated by the x_i can be expressed in the form*

$$y_1^{l_1} y_2^{l_2} \cdots y_k^{l_k}, \tag{A.1}$$

with $l_i \in \mathbb{Z}$.

The proof of Lemma A.2 is in the form of an algorithm, called the *collecting process* and defined below, that converts a finite string involving the elements x_i into the form (A.1).[8] The collecting process rests on, and is motivated by, the following commutator identities, which are [8, (11.1.5,-8,-9,-11)].

$$vu = uv[v, u] \tag{A.2}$$

$$v^{-1}u = u[v, u]^{-1}v^{-1} \tag{A.3}$$

$$vu^{-1} = u^{-1}vv_2v_4 \cdots v_5^{-1}v_3^{-1}v_1^{-1} \qquad (v_1 := [v, u];\ v_{i+1} := [v_i, u]) \tag{A.4}$$

$$v^{-1}u^{-1} = u^{-1}v_1v_3v_5 \cdots v_4^{-1}v_2^{-1}v^{-1} \qquad (v_1 := [v, u];\ v_{i+1} := [v_i, u]) \tag{A.5}$$

Definition A.3 (The collecting process)**.** [8, §11.1] Let $a := a_1 \cdots a_n$ be a string of commutators, and their inverses, involving elements $x_1, \ldots, x_r$ of an s-step nilpotent[9] group. We say that a is in *collected form* if $a_1 \prec \ldots \prec a_n$. For $m \in [0, n]$ we say that a has *collected part* $a_1 \cdots a_m$ if $a_1 \prec \ldots \prec a_m$ and

---

[7] Of course, when a commutator $[\alpha, \beta]$ is interpreted as a group element then the inverse of that group element is equal to the interpretation of $[\beta, \alpha]$. As formal commutators, however, $[\beta, \alpha]$ and $[\alpha, \beta]^{-1}$ are considered distinct.

[8] Much of this material is already in the literature, but some of our arguments rely on an inspection of existing proofs, not just on the results, and in setting up notation for these arguments we unavoidably end up repeating much of this standard material.

[9] The collecting process can be defined for *positive* strings of commutators (i.e. those involving only commutators, not their inverses) without the assumption that the x_i are elements of a nilpotent group; see [8, §11.1] for details.

$a_m \prec a_i$ for $i > m$ but $a_{m+1} \succ a_j$ for some $j > m+1$. The string $a_{m+1} \cdots a_n$ is called the *uncollected part* of a.

We define a *collecting operator* $\mathcal{C}$ on the set of strings of commutators as follows. If a is in collected form then we simply define $\mathcal{C}(a) := a$. If a is not in collected form then write β for the commutator earliest with respect to the order $\prec$ such that $\beta^{\pm 1}$ appears in the uncollected part of a, and suppose that a_j is the leftmost of the a_i in the uncollected part that is equal to $\beta^{\pm 1}$. Write α for the commutator satisfying $a_{j-1} = \alpha^{\pm 1}$, and define $\alpha_1 := [\alpha, \beta]$ and $\alpha_{i+1} := [\alpha_i, \beta]$ for $i = 2, \ldots, s-1$. Define α_i to be trivial for $i \geq s$.

If $a_j = \beta$ and $a_{j-1} = \alpha$ then

$$\mathcal{C}(a) := a_1 \cdots a_{j-2} \beta \alpha [\alpha, \beta] a_{j+1} \cdots a_n,$$

and we say that $\mathcal{C}$ performs a *transformation of type 1* on a. If $a_j = \beta$ and $a_{j-1} = \alpha^{-1}$ then

$$\mathcal{C}(a) := a_1 \cdots a_{j-2} \beta [\alpha, \beta]^{-1} \alpha^{-1} a_{j+1} \cdots a_n,$$

and we say that $\mathcal{C}$ performs a *transformation of type 2* on a. If $a_j = \beta^{-1}$ and $a_{j-1} = \alpha$ then

$$\mathcal{C}(a) := a_1 \cdots a_{j-2} \beta^{-1} \alpha \alpha_2 \alpha_4 \cdots \alpha_5^{-1} \alpha_3^{-1} \alpha_1^{-1} a_{j+1} \cdots a_n,$$

and we say that $\mathcal{C}$ performs a *transformation of type 3* on a. If $a_j = \beta^{-1}$ and $a_{j-1} = \alpha^{-1}$ then

$$\mathcal{C}(a) := a_1 \cdots a_{j-2} \beta^{-1} \alpha_1 \alpha_3 \alpha_5 \cdots \alpha_4^{-1} \alpha_2^{-1} \alpha^{-1} a_{j+1} \cdots a_n,$$

and we say that $\mathcal{C}$ performs a *transformation of type 4* on a. The collecting process is then the sequence $a, \mathcal{C}(a), \mathcal{C}^2(a), \ldots$.

Finally, we will often talk about the set of *copies* of a commutator in the collecting process. Each a_i in the original string a is said to be a copy of the commutator γ if $a_i = \gamma$, or a copy of γ^{-1} if $a_i = \gamma^{-1}$. The collecting operator $\mathcal{C}$ is then thought of as permuting the existing copies of the commutators and of creating a new copy of $[\alpha, \beta]$ in the case of a transformation of type 1; a new copy of $[\alpha, \beta]^{-1}$ in the case of a transformation of type 2; new copies of $\alpha_2, \alpha_4 \ldots$ and $\alpha_1^{-1} \alpha_3^{-1} \ldots$ in the case of a transformation of type 3; and new copies of $\alpha_1, \alpha_3 \ldots$ and $\alpha_2^{-1} \alpha_4^{-1} \ldots$ in the case of a transformation of type 4. $\diamond$

Proof of Lemma A.2. An element in the group generated by the x_i is, by definition, equal in the group to some string a in the x_i. It is clear (see [8, §11.1] for details) that the sequence $a, \mathcal{C}(a), \mathcal{C}^2(a), \ldots$ of strings in the collecting process is eventually constant and in collected form (modulo commutators of weight greater than s). Finally, identities (A.2), (A.3), (A.4) and (A.5) show that the sequence $a, \mathcal{C}(a), \mathcal{C}^2(a), \ldots$ is constant as a sequence of group elements. $\square$

Only certain commutators will arise during the collecting process. For example, x_2 never needs to be moved to the left of x_1, and so the exponent of the commutator $[x_1, x_2]$ in expression (A.1) will always be zero. It thus makes sense to introduce the following definition.

Definition A.4 (Basic commutators)**.** The commutators that can arise when the collecting process is applied to a string consisting only of $x_1, \ldots, x_r$, and can hence have non-zero exponents in expression (A.1), are called *basic commutators.* We shall denote them $c_1 \prec \ldots \prec c_t$.

A more explicit definition of basic commutators is given in [8, §11.1], but it is formulated precisely so as to be equivalent to Definition A.4.

We are now in a position to make another definition, first seen in [1].

Definition A.5 (Nilpotent progressions)**.** Let G be a nilpotent group. Let $x_1, \ldots, x_r$ be elements of G, and let $c_1, \ldots, c_t$ be the list of basic commutators in the x_i. Let $L = (L_1, \ldots, L_r)$ be a vector of positive integers. Then the *nilpotent progression* on $x_1, \ldots, x_r$ with side lengths $L_1, \ldots, L_r$ is defined to be the set

$$P(x_1, \ldots, x_r; L) := \{c_1^{l_1} \cdots c_t^{l_t} : |l_i| \leq L^{\chi(c_i)}\}.$$

The following results give a straightforward relationship between nilprogressions and nilpotent progressions.

Lemma A.6. *Let $x_1, \ldots, x_r$ be elements of a nilpotent group and let $L = (L_1, \ldots, L_r)$ be a vector of positive integers. Let y be a string of x_i and their inverses featuring p_j copies of x_j and n_j copies of x_j^{-1}, with $p_j + n_j \leq L_j$. Then for each $i = 1, \ldots, t$, applying the collecting process to y results in at most $L^{\chi(c_i)}$ copies of c_i and c_i^{-1} between them.*

Proof. The collecting process never creates any new copies of x_i or x_i^{-1}, and so the lemma certainly holds whenever c_i has total weight 1. We may therefore, by induction, prove the lemma for basic commutators of a given total weight

$$\omega > 1 \tag{A.6}$$

under the assumption that it holds for all commutators of total weight less than ω.

It follows from (A.6) that any commutator of weight ω arising from the collecting process is of the form $[c_i, c_j]^{\pm 1}$ for some basic commutators c_i, c_j of total weight less than ω. We will prove the lemma by defining an injection f from the set of copies of $[c_i, c_j]^{\pm 1}$ to the set of pairs of copies of $c_i^{\pm 1}$ and $c_j^{\pm 1}$. This is sufficient as by induction the number of such pairs is at most $L^{\chi(c_i)} L^{\chi(c_j)} = L^{\chi([c_i, c_j])}$.

If a copy z of $[c_i, c_j]^{\pm 1}$ arose from a collecting transformation of type 1 or 2 then this can only have been as a result of interchanging a copy a of $c_i^{\pm 1}$ and a copy b of c_j. In this case simply define $f(z) = (a, b)$.

If z arose as from a collecting transformation of type 3 or 4 then it must have arisen from interchanging a copy b' of c_j^{-1} and a copy of some commutator c_k. Writing $v_0 := c_k$ and $v_{q+1} = [v_q, c_j]$, it must therefore be the case that c_i is equal to some v_q. If $q = 0$ then z arose from interchanging a copy a' of c_i with b', and we define $f(z) = (a', b')$. If $q > 0$ then exactly one copy a'' of v_q will also have arisen as a result of the same transformation as that producing z. In this case we define $f(z) = (a'', b')$.

Now that we have defined f it remains to show that it is an injection. A given pair of copies of $c_i^{\pm 1}$ and $c_j^{\pm 1}$ will be interchanged at most once during the collection process, and so if two distinct copies z, z' of $[c_i, c_j]$ both arose from interchanging copies of c_i and c_j (which is to say as a result of a transformation of type 1 or 2, or of type 3 or 4 in the case $q = 0$) then we certainly have $f(z) \neq f(z')$. Furthermore, a given transformation of type 3 or 4 produces at most one copy of any commutator c_l, and so if z and z' both arose from transformations of type 3 or 4 in the case $q > 0$ then we also have $f(z) \neq f(z')$.

Finally, suppose a copy z of $[c_i, c_j]^{\pm 1}$ arose from a transformation of type 3 or 4 in the case $q > 0$. It follows from (A.4) and (A.5) that the copy a'' of $c_i = v_q$ produced as a result of the transformation producing z will already be to the right of b', and so a'' and b' will never have to be interchanged and so no z' arising from a transformation of type 1 or 2, or of type 3 or 4 in the case $q = 0$, will have $f(z') = (a'', b')$. □

Corollary A.7. *Let $x_1, \ldots, x_r$ be elements of a nilpotent group and let $L = (L_1, \ldots, L_r)$ be a vector of positive integers. Let y be a string of x_i and their inverses featuring p_j copies of x_j and n_j copies of x_j^{-1}, with $p_j + n_j \leq L_j$. Then y can be expressed in the form*

$$c_1^{l_1} c_2^{l_2} \cdots c_t^{l_t}, \tag{A.7}$$

with $l_i = p_i - n_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, r$ and $|l_i| \leq L^{\chi(c_i)}$ for every i.

Corollary A.8. *Let $x_1, \ldots, x_r$ be elements of a nilpotent group and let $L = (L_1, \ldots, L_r)$ be a vector of positive integers. Then*

$$P^*(x_1, \ldots, x_r; L) \subset P(x_1, \ldots, x_r; L).$$

Here, of course, P^* denotes a nilprogression, as in Definition 1.3, while P denotes a nilpotent progression, as in Definition A.5.

B Decompositions of commutators

It is a straightforward exercise to show that in a 2-step nilpotent group we have the identity

$$[xx', yy'] = [x, y][x', y][x, y'][x', y'].$$

The aim of this appendix is to develop a more general calculus for expressing commutators of products as products of commutators.

In order to achieve this we will need to consider commutators involving $x_1, \ldots, x_r$ in more detail than in Appendix A. For instance, given a commutator α it will be helpful to be able to refer to the lower-weight components that were used to construct α, such as the components $x_1, x_2, x_3, [x_2, x_3]$ in the case $\alpha = [x_1, [x_2, x_3]]$. It will also be useful to distinguish between, for example, the commutator $[x_1, x_2]$ and the function $(x_1, x_2) \mapsto [x_1, x_2]$, which we shall call a *commutator form*. We formalise these notions as follows.

Definition B.1 (Arguments and components of a commutator)**.** To every formal commutator α in the letters $x_1,\ldots,x_r$ we assign a set $C(\alpha)$ of *components*, defined recursively as follows. For each i define $C(x_i)$ to be the singleton $\{x_i\}$ and, given two formal commutators α,α' in the x_i, define $C([\alpha,\alpha']):=C(\alpha)\cup C(\alpha')\cup\{[\alpha,\alpha']\}$. We shall denote by $\alpha\sqsubset\beta$ or $\beta\sqsupset\alpha$ the fact that α is a component of β. The letters x_{i_j} featuring in a formal commutator α will be called the *arguments* of α.

Definition B.2 (Commutator form)**.** A *commutator form* of weight n on the letters $x_1,\ldots,x_r$ will be a function from $\{x_1,\ldots,x_r\}^n$ to the set of formal commutators in the x_i, defined recursively as follows. The identity function ι given by $\iota(x_i):=x_i$ is the unique commutator form of weight 1. The commutator forms of weight n will consist of all functions γ for which there exist commutator forms γ_1,γ_2 with respective weights m_1,m_2 summing to n, and a permutation[10] $\sigma\in S_n$, such that

$$\gamma(x_{i_1},\ldots,x_{i_n})=[\gamma_1(x_{i_{\sigma(1)}},\ldots,x_{i_{\sigma(m_1)}}),\gamma_2(x_{i_{\sigma(m_1+1)}},\ldots,x_{i_{\sigma(n)}})]$$

for all $i_j\in[1,r]$. We will denote by $|\chi(\gamma)|$ the weight of a commutator form γ.

The principal results are the following.

Proposition B.3. *Let Γ be a nilpotent group and for each $j=1,\ldots,r$ let $x_1^{(j)},\ldots,x_{m_j}^{(j)}$ be elements of Γ. Suppose that α is a commutator form of weight r. Then there exist commutators $\eta_1,\ldots,\eta_t$ in the $x_i^{(j)}$ with the following properties.*

- *(i)* $\alpha(\prod_{i=1}^{m_1}x_i^{(1)},\ldots,\prod_{i=1}^{m_r}x_i^{(r)})=\eta_1\cdots\eta_t$.
- *(ii) For each tuple $(x_{i_1}^{(1)},\ldots,x_{i_r}^{(r)})$ there is some η_l equal to $\alpha(x_{i_1}^{(1)},\ldots,x_{i_r}^{(r)})$.*
- *(iii) For every $l\in[1,t]$ and every $j\in[1,r]$ there is at least one $i\in[1,m_j]$ with $x_i^{(j)}\sqsubset\eta_l$.*
- *(iv) The η_l are all distinct as formal commutators in the $x_i^{(j)}$.*
- *(v) If η_l is not of the form $\alpha(x_{i_1}^{(1)},\ldots,x_{i_r}^{(r)})$ then η_l has weight greater than r.*

Proposition B.4. *Let α be a commutator form of weight r, let $x_1,\ldots,x_r$ be elements of an s-step nilpotent group Γ, and let $(l_1,\ldots,l_r)$ be a vector of positive integers. Let $\xi_1,\ldots,\xi_k$ be the complete list, in ascending order with respect to $\prec$, of commutators in the x_i of weight greater than r, and write $\alpha(x_1,\ldots,x_r)$, $\zeta_1,\ldots,\zeta_t$ for the ordered list of basic commutators in $\alpha(x_1,\ldots,x_r)$, $\xi_1,\ldots,\xi_k$. Then for each $i=1,\ldots,t$ there exists an integer m_i with $|m_i|\le l^{\chi(\zeta_i)}$, where $\chi(\zeta_i)$ is the weight vector of ζ_i as a commutator in the x_i, such that*

$$\alpha(x_1^{l_1},\ldots,x_r^{l_r})=\alpha(x_1,\ldots,x_r)^{l_1\cdots l_r}\zeta_1^{m_1}\cdots\zeta_t^{m_t}$$

in Γ.

Remark B.5. The commutators ζ_i may not be distinct as commutators in the x_i, but they are distinct as formal commutators in the letters ξ_i.

---

[10] The permutation σ is necessary in the definition of a commutator form only to ensure, for example, that the function $\gamma:(x_1,x_2,x_3)\mapsto[[x_1,x_3],x_2]$ is not excluded for the rather artificial reason that the elements x_1,x_2,x_3 appear out of order in the definition of the function.

In proving these results we will repeatedly make use of certain commutator identities. Let u, v, w be elements of a group. We start by recalling the trivial identity (A.2), which was

$$vu = uv[v,u], \tag{B.1}$$

and note that repeated application of it implies that

$$\begin{aligned} uvw[w,uv] &= wuv \\ &= uw[w,u]v \\ &= uwv[w,u][[w,u],v] \\ &= uvw[w,v][w,u][[w,u],v]. \end{aligned}$$

Combined with another trivial identity, $[a,b]^{-1} = [b,a]$, this implies that

$$[u,w][v,w] = [[w,u],v][uv,w] \tag{B.2}$$

and

$$[w,v][w,u] = [w,uv][v,[w,u]]. \tag{B.3}$$

Lemma B.6. *Let $x_1,\dots,x_m,y_1,\dots,y_n$ be symbols. Suppose that $\xi_1,\dots,\xi_r$ are distinct formal commutators in the x_i and that $\zeta_1,\dots,\zeta_t$ are distinct formal commutators in the y_i. Suppose further that β,β' are formal commutators in the ξ_i and the ζ_i that have no components of the form $[\xi_i,\xi_j]$ or $[\zeta_i,\zeta_j]$. Now suppose that β and β' are equal when viewed as commutators in the x_i and y_i. Then β and β' are equal as commutators in the ξ_i and ζ_i.*

Proof. Viewing β as a commutator in the x_i and y_i, write $\eta_1,\dots,\eta_u$ for the list of components of β that are maximal with respect to the property of having no y_i as an argument, and write $\gamma_1,\dots,\gamma_v$ for the list of components that are maximal with respect to the property of having no x_i as an argument. Express β as a commutator in the η_i and the γ_i. Thus, for example, if

$$\beta = [[[x_1,x_2],y_1],[x_1,x_2]]$$

then $\eta_1 = \eta_2 = [x_1,x_2]$ and $\gamma_1 = y_1$ and we would have

$$\beta = [[\eta_1,\gamma_1],\eta_2].$$

Note that the η_i,γ_i and the form of β in terms of the η_i and γ_i are uniquely determined by the form of β in terms of the x_i and y_i.

Viewing β as a commutator in the ξ_i and ζ_i once more, the only way that an η_l can have arisen is as a commutator in the ξ_i. In fact, since β contains no component of the form $[\xi_i,\xi_j]$, the component η_l must have arisen as some ξ_i. Similarly, each component γ_l must have arisen as some ζ_i. Since the ξ_i and ζ_i are distinct, these ξ_i and ζ_i are uniquely determined, and so the form of β as a commutator in the ξ_i and ζ_i is uniquely determined by the η_i and γ_i and by the form of β_i with respect to the η_i and the γ_i.

This in turn was uniquely determined by the form of β as a commutator in the x_i and y_i, and so the proof is complete. □

Lemma B.7. *Let $x_1,\dots,x_m,y_1,\dots,y_n$ be elements of a nilpotent group Γ. Then there is a finite list $\eta_1,\dots,\eta_r$ of commutators in the x_i and y_j satisfying the following properties.*

(i) $[x_1 \cdots x_m, y_1 \cdots y_n] = \eta_1 \cdots \eta_r$.

(ii) *For each pair* $x_i, y_{i'}$ *there is some* η_j *equal to* $[x_i, y_{i'}]$.

(iii) *Every* η_j *has at least one* x_i *and at least one* $y_{i'}$ *amongst its arguments.*

(iv) *The* η_j *are all distinct as formal commutators in the* $x_i, y_{i'}$.

(v) *No* η_j *has a component of the form* $[x_i, x_{i'}]$ *or* $[y_i, y_{i'}]$.

(vi) *If* η_j *is not of the form* $[x_i, y_{i'}]$ *then* η *has weight greater than 2.*

Proof. For each element $g \in \Gamma$ define

$$\theta(g) := \sup\{i : g \in \Gamma_i\}.$$

Write s for the nilpotency class of Γ and note that if $(\min_i \theta(x_i)) + (\min_j \theta(y_j)) > s$ then $[x_1 \cdots x_m, y_1 \cdots y_n]$ and the $[x_i, y_j]$ are all equal to the identity element, and so the result is trivial. By induction, it is therefore sufficient to fix s and $d \leq s$; to assume that

$$\min_i \theta(x_i) + \min_j \theta(y_j) = d; \tag{B.4}$$

and to assume that the result holds for elements of s-step nilpotent groups satisfying

$$\min_i \theta(x_i) + \min_j \theta(y_j) > d.$$

Such a statement is trivial in the case $m + n \leq 2$, and so by another induction we may assume also that $m + n \geq 3$ and that the result holds under condition (B.4) for all smaller values of $m + n$.

The assumption that $m + n \geq 3$ implies in particular that at least one of m and n is at least 2. We shall assume that $n \geq 2$; the argument in the case $m \geq 2$ is essentially identical and is left to the reader. Thanks to this assumption we may apply (B.3) and conclude that

$$[x_1 \cdots x_m, y_1 \cdots y_n] = [x_1 \cdots x_m, y_2 \cdots y_n]\,[x_1 \cdots x_m, y_1]\,[[x_1 \cdots x_m, y_1], y_2 \cdots y_n]. \tag{B.5}$$

If the first induction hypothesis does not apply to $[x_1 \cdots x_m, y_2 \cdots y_n]$ then the second certainly does, and so we may assume that there are commutators $\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_q$ in $x_1, \ldots, x_m, y_2, \ldots, y_n$ such that the following conditions hold.

1. We have $[x_1 \cdots x_m, y_2 \cdots y_n] = \eta_1 \cdots \eta_q$.
2. For each pair $x_i, y_{i'}$ with $i' \geq 2$ there is some η_j equal to $[x_i, y_{i'}]$.
3. Every η_j has at least one x_i and at least one $y_{i'}$ with $i' \geq 2$ amongst its arguments.
4. The η_j are all distinct as formal commutators in the $x_i, y_{i'}$.
5. No η_j has a component of the form $[x_i, x_{i'}]$ or $[y_i, y_{i'}]$.
6. If η_j is not of the form $[x_i, y_{i'}]$ then η has weight greater than 2.

Similarly, we have commutators $\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_r$ in the x_i and y_1 such that

7. We have $[x_1 \cdots x_m, y_1] = \xi_1 \cdots \xi_r$.
8. For each x_i there is some ξ_j equal to $[x_i, y_1]$.
9. Every ξ_j has y_1 and at least one x_i amongst its arguments.
10. The ξ_j are all distinct as formal commutators in the $x_i, y_{i'}$.
11. No ξ_j has a component of the form $[x_i, x_{i'}]$.
12. If ξ_j is not of the form $[x_i, y_1]$ then η has weight greater than 2.

It follows from condition 7 that we may write

$$[[x_1 \cdots x_m, y_1], y_2 \cdots y_n] = [\xi_1 \cdots \xi_r, y_2 \cdots y_n], \tag{B.6}$$

while condition 9 implies that for evey j we have

$$\theta(\xi_j) \geq \min_i \theta(x_i) + \theta(y_1).$$

This implies in particular that

$$\min_i \theta(\xi_i) + \min_{j \in [2,n]} \theta(y_j) > \min_i \theta(x_i) + \min_j \theta(y_j),$$

and hence by (B.4) that

$$\min_i \theta(\xi_i) + \min_{j \in [2,n]} \theta(y_j) > d.$$

The first induction hypothesis therefore applies, and so we may assume that there exist commutators $\zeta_1, \ldots, \zeta_t$ in the ξ_i, y_j satisfying the following conditions.

13. We have $[\xi_1 \cdots \xi_r, y_2 \cdots y_n] = \zeta_1 \cdots \zeta_t$.
14. Every ζ_j has at least one ξ_i and at least one $y_{i'}$ with $i' \geq 2$ amongst its arguments.
15. The ζ_j are all distinct as formal commutators in the $\xi_i, y_{i'}$.
16. No ζ_j has a component of the form $[\xi_i, \xi_{i'}]$ or $[y_i, y_{i'}]$.

It follows from (B.5) and (B.6) and conditions 1, 7 and 13 that

$$[x_1 \cdots x_m, y_1 \cdots y_n] = \eta_1 \cdots \eta_q \xi_1 \cdots \xi_r \zeta_1 \cdots \zeta_t,$$

and so the η_i, ξ_i, ζ_i satisfy condition (i) of the lemma. By conditions 2 and 8 they satisfy condition (ii) of the lemma, and by conditions 3, 9 and 14 they satisfy condition (iii). It follows from conditions 5, 11, 12 and 16 that they satisfy condition (v) of the lemma, and from conditions 6, 12 and 14 that they satisfy condition (vi).

It remains to see that the η_i, ξ_i, ζ_i satisfy condition (iv) of the lemma. No two η_i can be equal as formal commutators in the x_i, y_j thanks to condition 4, and the same is true of the ξ_i by condition 10. It follows from Lemma B.6 and from conditions 15 and 16 that the same is also true of the ζ_i.

It follows from conditions 8 and 14 that each ξ_i and each ζ_j has y_1 as an argument, but none of the η_i has y_1 as an argument, and so no η_i can be equal to a ξ_j or a ζ_j as a formal commutator in the x_i, y_j. Moreover, y_1 is the only of the y_j to feature as an argument of a ξ_i, whereas it follows from condition 14 that each ζ_i has at least one y_j other than y_1 as an argument, and so no ζ_i can equal a ξ_j. Thus η_i, ξ_i, ζ_i satisfy condition (iv) of the lemma, and so the proof is complete. $\square$

Proof of Proposition B.3. Abusing notation slightly, we shall abbreviate

$$\alpha = \alpha(\textstyle\prod_{i=1}^{m_1} x_i^{(1)}, \dots, \prod_{i=1}^{m_r} x_i^{(r)}).$$

If α is of weight 1 then the result is trivial, and so we may assume that $r > 1$ and, by induction, that the result holds for all commutator forms of weight less than r. Since $r > 1$ we may write

$$\alpha = \Big[\alpha_1(\textstyle\prod_{i=1}^{m_1} x_i^{(1)}, \dots, \prod_{i=1}^{m_d} x_i^{(d)}), \alpha_2(\prod_{i=1}^{m_{d+1}} x_i^{(d+1)}, \dots, \prod_{i=1}^{m_r} x_i^{(r)})\Big]$$

for commutator forms α_1 and α_2 of weight d and $d' := r - d$, respectively, with

$$1 \le d, d' < r. \tag{B.7}$$

For notational convenience let us relabel $x_i^{(d+1)}, \dots, x_i^{(r)}$ as $y_i^{(1)}, \dots, y_i^{(d')}$, and $m_{d+1}, \dots, m_r$ as $n_1, \dots, n_{d'}$; thus

$$\alpha = \Big[\alpha_1(\textstyle\prod_{i=1}^{m_1} x_i^{(1)}, \dots, \prod_{i=1}^{m_d} x_i^{(d)}), \alpha_2(\prod_{i=1}^{n_1} y_i^{(1)}, \dots, \prod_{i=1}^{n_{d'}} y_i^{(d')})\Big]. \tag{B.8}$$

By (B.7) and the induction hypothesis there exist commutators $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k$ in the $x_i^{(j)}$ and commutators $\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_q$ in the $y_i^{(j)}$ satisfying the following conditions.

1. We have $\alpha_1(\prod_{i=1}^{m_1} x_i^{(1)}, \dots, \prod_{i=1}^{m_d} x_i^{(d)}) = \xi_1 \cdots \xi_k$.
2. We have $\alpha_2(\prod_{i=1}^{n_1} y_i^{(1)}, \dots, \prod_{i=1}^{n_{d'}} y_i^{(d')}) = \zeta_1 \cdots \zeta_q$.
3. For each tuple $(x_{i_1}^{(1)}, \dots, x_{i_d}^{(r)})$ there is some ξ_l equal to $\alpha_1(x_{i_1}^{(1)}, \dots, x_{i_d}^{(d)})$.
4. For each tuple $(y_{i_1}^{(1)}, \dots, y_{i_{d'}}^{(d')})$ there is some ζ_l equal to $\alpha_2(y_{i_1}^{(1)}, \dots, y_{i_{d'}}^{(d')})$.
5. For every $l \in [1, k]$ and every $j \in [1, d]$ there is at least one $i \in [1, m_j]$ with $x_i^{(j)} \sqsubset \xi_l$.
6. For every $l \in [1, q]$ and every $j \in [1, d']$ there is at least one $i \in [1, n_j]$ with $y_i^{(j)} \sqsubset \zeta_l$.
7. The ξ_l are all distinct as formal commutators in the $x_i^{(j)}$.
8. The ζ_l are all distinct as formal commutators in the $y_i^{(j)}$.

By (B.8) and conditions 1 and 2 we have

$$\alpha = [\xi_1 \cdots \xi_k, \zeta_1 \cdots \zeta_q],$$

and so by Lemma B.7 we may assume that there exist commutators $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_t$ in the ξ_i and ζ_i satisfying the following conditions.

9. We have $\alpha = \eta_1 \cdots \eta_t$.
10. For each pair $\xi_i, \zeta_{i'}$ there is some η_j equal to $[\xi_i, \zeta_{i'}]$.
11. Every η_j has at least one ξ_i and at least one $\zeta_{i'}$ amongst its arguments.
12. The η_j are all distinct as formal commutators in the $\xi_i, \zeta_{i'}$.
13. No η_j has a component of the form $[\xi_i, \xi_{i'}]$ or $[\zeta_i, \zeta_{i'}]$.

Lemma B.7 also implies that every η_j that is not of the form $[\xi_i, \zeta_{i'}]$ has weight greater than 2, and so, viewing the η_i now as commutators in the $x_i^{(j)}$ and $y_i^{(j)}$, it follows from conditions 5, 6 and 11 that they satisfy condition (v) of the proposition. Moreover, condition 9 implies that they satisfy condition (i) of the proposition. Condition (ii) follows from conditions 3, 4 and 10. Condition (iii) follows from conditions 5, 6 and 11. Finally, in light of conditions 7, 8, 12 and 13, condition (iv) follows from Lemma B.6. □

Corollary B.8. *Let α be a commutator form of weight r, let $x_1, \ldots, x_r$ be elements of an s-step nilpotent group Γ, and let $(l_1, \ldots, l_r)$ be a vector of positive integers. Let $\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_k$ be the complete list, in ascending order with respect to $\prec$, of commutators in the x_i of weight greater than r. Then $\alpha(x_1^{l_1}, \ldots, x_r^{l_r})$ is equal in Γ to a product, in some order, of precisely $\prod_i l_i$ copies of $\alpha(x_1, \ldots, x_r)$ and at most $l^{\chi(\xi_j)}$ copies of each ξ_j.*

Proof. The fact that $\alpha(x_1^{l_1}, \ldots, x_r^{l_r})$ may be written as a product of commutators that includes at least $\prod_i l_i$ copies of $\alpha(x_1, \ldots, x_r)$ follows from conditions (i) and (ii) of Proposition B.3, and the fact that we may take the other commutators in this product to have weight greater than r follows from condition (v) of that proposition. The bound on the number of copies of each ξ_j and the fact that no further copies of $\alpha(x_1, \ldots, x_r)$ are required follow from condition (iv). □

Proof of Proposition B.4. This follows from applying Corollary A.7 to the product from Corollary B.8. □

C Generating sets of p-groups

In this appendix we derive the following basic properties of p-groups.

Lemma C.1. *If Γ is an abelian p-group and Γ' is a subgroup of Γ then the rank of Γ' is at most the rank of Γ.*

Lemma C.2. *Let Γ be a p-group of rank r and suppose that S is a generating set for Γ. Then there is a subset $S' \subset S$ of cardinality r that also generates Γ.*

Remark C.3. Lemma C.1 still holds without the assumption that Γ is a p-group. The corresponding statement for an arbitrary finite abelian group can be deduced from the p-group statement using arguments similar to those found in Section 5. We do not need the more general statement in the present work, however, and so we omit the details. The assumption that Γ is abelian, on the other hand, is necessary. For example, if F is the free product of n copies of the cyclic group with two elements and Γ is the quotient F/F_3 then Γ is of rank n but $[\Gamma, \Gamma]$, for example, is of rank $n(n-1)/2$.

Remark C.4. Lemma C.2 does not necessarily hold if Γ is not a p-group. For example, the set $\{2, 3\}$ is a generating set for $\mathbb{Z}/6\mathbb{Z}$, but each of $\{2\}$ and $\{3\}$ generates a proper subgroup.

The proof of Lemma C.1 is straightforward.

Proof of Lemma C.1. Suppose that Γ is of rank r, with minimal generating set $x_1, \ldots, x_r$, say. We will show by induction on r that the rank of Γ' is at most r, this being trivial when $r = 0$.

Let m be the largest integer with the property that $\Gamma' < p^m \cdot \Gamma$. The subgroup $p^m \cdot \Gamma$ is generated by the set $p^m x_1, \ldots, p^m x_r$, and so has rank at most r. Therefore, upon replacing Γ by $p^m \cdot \Gamma$ if necessary, we may assume that Γ' is not contained in $p \cdot \Gamma$, and hence that there is some $y \in \Gamma'$ such that $px \neq y$ for every $x \in \Gamma$.

Since $x_1, \ldots, x_r$ generate Γ we may write $y = l_1 x_1 + \ldots + l_r x_r$, and by definition of y there must be at least one i for which l_i is not divisible by p. Without loss of generality we shall assume that l_r is not divisible by p. Since the order of x_r is a power of p, the integer l_r has a multiplicative inverse, say q, modulo the order of the x_r. This implies that

$$x_r = q(y - l_1 x_1 - \ldots - l_{r-1} x_{r-1}),$$

and in particular that the quotient $\Gamma/\langle y\rangle$ is generated by $x_1 + \langle y\rangle, \ldots, x_{r-1} + \langle y\rangle$, and hence has rank at most $r - 1$. The group $\Gamma'/\langle y\rangle$ is isomorphic to a subgroup of $\Gamma/\langle y\rangle$, and hence has rank at most $r - 1$ by induction. It follows that Γ' has rank at most r, as claimed. □

The proof of Lemma C.2 rests on a deeper property of p-groups, the statement of which requires a definition.

Definition C.5 (Frattini subgroup)**.** Let Γ be a finite p-group. Then the *Frattini subgroup* $\Phi(\Gamma)$ of Γ is defined by $\Phi(\Gamma) := \Gamma^p[\Gamma, \Gamma]$, where here (unlike elsewhere in this work) the notation Γ^p means the group $\langle\, g^p \mid g \in \Gamma\,\rangle$.

Theorem C.6 (Burnside basis theorem)**.** [9, Theorem 4.8] *Let Γ be a p-group and write $\Phi(\Gamma)$ for its Frattini subgroup. Then a subset S of Γ generates Γ if and only if the image of S in $\Gamma/\Phi(\Gamma)$ generates $\Gamma/\Phi(\Gamma)$ as a vector space over $\mathbb{F}_p$.*

Proof of Lemma C.2. The Burnside basis theorem (Theorem C.6) implies in particular that all minimal generating sets of Γ have the same cardinality, from which Lemma C.2 follows immediately. □

References

[1] E. Breuillard and B. J. Green. Approximate groups. I. The torsion-free nilpotent case, *J. Inst. Math. Jussieu* **10**(1) (2011), 37-57.

[2] E. Breuillard, B. J. Green and T. C. Tao. The structure of approximate groups, to appear in *Publ. Math. IHES.* `arXiv:1110.5008`.

[3] E. Breuillard, B. J. Green and T. C. Tao. A nilpotent Freiman dimension lemma, to appear in *special volume of EJC in honour of Yahya Hamidoune*. `arXiv:1112.4174`.

[4] M.-C. Chang. A polynomial bound in Freiman's theorem, *Duke Math. J.* **113**(3) (2002), 399-419.

[5] G. A. Freiman. Foundations of a structural theory of set addition, *Translations of Mathematical Monographs* **37**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI (1973). Translated from the 1966 Russian version, published by Kazan Gos. Ped. Inst..

[6] B. J. Green. Approximate groups and their applications: work of Bourgain, Gamburd, Helfgott and Sarnak, *Current events bulletin of the AMS* (2010). `arXiv:0911.3354`.

[7] B. J. Green and I. Z. Ruzsa. Freiman's theorem in an arbitrary abelian group, *J. Lond. Math. Soc.* **75**(1) (2007), 163-175.

[8] M. Hall. *The theory of groups*, Amer. Math. Soc./Chelsea, Providence, RI (1999).

[9] E. I. Khukhro. p-automorphisms of finite p-groups, *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.* **246**, Cambridge Univ. Press (1998).

[10] I. Z. Ruzsa. Generalized arithmetical progressions and sumsets, *Acta Math. Hungar.* **65**(4) (1994), 379-388.

[11] I. Z. Ruzsa. An analog of Freiman's theorem in groups, Structure theory of set addition, *Astérisque* **258** (1999), 323-326.

[12] T. Sanders. On the Bogolyubov–Ruzsa lemma, to appear in *Anal. PDE*. `arXiv:1011.0107`.

[13] T. C. Tao. Product set estimates for non-commutative groups, *Combinatorica* **28**(5) (2008), 547-594.

[14] T. C. Tao and V. H. Vu. *Additive combinatorics*, Cambridge Univ. Press (2006).